JÜRGEN HANNEDER

ABHINAVAGUPTA'S PHILOSOPHY OF REVELATION

MĀLINĪŚLOKAVĀRTTIKA I, 1-399

EGBERT FORSTEN

Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Revelation

GRONINGEN ORIENTAL STUDIES

VOLUME XIV

Published under the auspices of the J. Gonda Foundation
Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences

Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Revelation

An edition and annotated translation of

Mālinīślokavārttika I, 1-399

Jürgen Hanneder

EGBERT FORSTEN · GRONINGEN

1998

Cover illustration: Panchaanana 'Siva. Pancavaktra Temple. Mandi.
Himachal Pradesh, 14th Century AD

This book was printed with financial support from the
J. Gonda Foundation, Amsterdam.

ISBN 90 6980 116 7

This book meets the requirements of ISO 9706:1994
Information and documentation
Paper for documents-requirements for permanence

Preface

The present work is an attempt to edit and translate the first part of the *Mālinīślokavārttika*, which deals with the origin of the Śaiva revelation. This text is, as its name indicates, a versified commentary on the *Mālinīvijayottaratantra* and was composed by the Kashmirian philosopher Abhinavagupta, whose literary activity must have centred around the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century AD. It is written in a style which sometimes looks simple, but never is, and the high degree of abstraction it displays combines with the bad state of the transmitted text to present a formidable task to every reader. As this case proves, only initial naivety and the commitment to finishing a degree in a predetermined time can persuade one to pursue such a work. Even if it is not stated at every other verse, my interpretation cannot be anything but provisional. Nevertheless it is, I think, useful to make this attempt, because the text is important for further studies of Abhinavagupta's concept of the Śaiva canon.

The greater part of this work was completed during a one and a half year stay in Oxford, where I had the opportunity to discuss approximately half of my edition and translation as well as many issues relating to the interpretation of this text with Professor Alexis Sanderson of All Souls College. He very generously made available to me some of his unpublished articles and drew my attention to many of the sources utilized in this thesis; it is no exaggeration to say that without his guidance this work would have been impossible.

I also wish to thank Professor Michael Hahn to whom I owe most of my philological training in Sanskrit and who took upon himself the supervision of this doctorate. His unfailing support in every stage was crucial to the completion of this thesis.

For creating the lively and stimulating atmosphere in Oxford I would like to thank my fellow students, especially my colleague and friend Dr. Dominic Goodall, not only for numerous discussions on Śaiva matters, but also for proofreading and improving the English, Dr. Harunaga Isaacson, especially for his close inspection of my edition, and Somdev Vasudeva for his comments; furthermore, in chronological order, Dr. Johannes Schneider (Berlin), Dr. Jayandra Soni (Marburg), Dr. Peri Sarveshvara Sharma (Marburg) and Prof. Walter Slaje

(Halle), and Philipp Maas, M.A., all of whom contributed to this work through valuable suggestions.

Finally I wish to thank Prof. Raffaelle Torella, who was the external supervisor for the doctoral thesis, and who provided me with a substantial list of corrections that helped a great deal to improve the present edition.

I should also like to thank B.P. Sharma, Jammu, who has been so kind as to provide me with copies of the two manuscripts, to the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen, and the Bodleian Library, Oxford, for the permission to use their manuscripts for the present publication.

Contents

Part 1

Introduction

and the more elastic category of *smṛti*. Because of their abandonment of orthopraxy – for instance through rejecting caste – certain religious groups, like the Buddhists or Jainas, were considered to be "un-vedic" (*vedabāhya*). For the orthodox, even Śaivas and Pāñcarātrikas were *vedabāhya* – and therefore not fundamentally different from the Buddhist – as they based their system on scriptures that were revealed by Śiva or Viṣṇu and disputed the authority

1 See 3.1. for the names of this text and Appendix 3 for the abbreviations used.

2 The term *śāstra* is sometimes used in the singular to describe "scripture" itself. Despite the fact that oral traditions play a great role in Indian literature, I am using the word "scripture", since on the lowest level of revelation the *śāstra* is a written document, even if it is supposed to be learnt by heart.

3 I have usually followed the convention to use "orthopraxy" instead of "orthodoxy" in order to emphasize that not so much belief in, but practice of a specific cult is the defining characteristic; nevertheless I do not feel competent to coin a new adjective.

of the Veda.[4] In order to maintain their position, the Tantrics had to clarify their rejection of the Veda. Yāmunācārya therefore differentiates between several meanings of *vedabāhya*: "Is it just to be different from the Veda, to perform acts prohibited by the Veda, or to hate the Veda?"[5] He then shows that none of these apply to his system, the Pāñcarātra, but argues that it is the absence of a secular law that complicates the issue: some Vedic injunctions, like non-violence, apply to all parts of society and not only to the higher castes that are usually thought to be the addressee of Vedic injunctions. Otherwise brahmin-murder would not be a crime for an outcast to whom the Veda does not apply.

In this context the term "Śaivism" unavoidably occludes as much as it defines, for an important segment of Śaivism is un-vedic in as much as it is based on a group of scriptures, the Tantras, which are held to be superior to the Veda.[6] There is in fact a wide range of cults, some of which accept the Veda while others include it as a lower and soteriologically ineffective revelation. The generally compromising position with regard to the Veda, however nominal in nature, is perhaps sufficient to justify the inclusion of Śaivism as a whole into "Hinduism". Abhinavagupta's own philosophy is certainly among the moderate majority of Śaiva cults that would not openly contradict orthopraxy, i.e. conformity to the rules of caste, purity and the like, but deny its efficacy in securing liberation. Such a position was explained, for instance, by the following line of reasoning: God, in order to preserve a functioning society, created lower scriptures that teach these behavioural rules and support them with the promise of reward. Proof for this is, according to Abhinavagupta's school, that the "wise men" who propagated these rules did not necessarily conform to them: "One should not do what they do, but do what they say."[7]

In order to clarify the matter we have to distinguish at least between a Veda-

---

4 Cf. *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, p. 53: *śaivaṃ pāśupataṃ caiva bauddham apy ārhataṃ tathā | kāpālaṃ pāñcarātraṃ cety evaṃ pāṣaṇḍatāsmṛteḥ || vaidikaṃ tāntrikaṃ ceti vibhāgakaraṇād api | gamyate pañcarātrasya vedabāhyatvaniścayaḥ ||*

5 *kim aṅga vedād anyatvaṃ vedabāhyatvam ucyate || tanniṣiddhārthakāritvam āho taddveṣaśīlatā* | *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, p. 135f.

6 The fact that (Tantric) Śaivism is defined by its unique revelation has not been recognized properly. Older textbooks on Hinduism or Śaivism often conflate Purāṇic and Tantric descriptions of Śiva and thereby fail to communicate the historical background characterized by an interaction of Tantric and Vedic elements. To state that the formless Śiva (*niṣkala*) "is the Highest Brahman of the Vedāntins" (GONDA (1976), p. 48) may explain the concept by analogy, but could not be more misleading when it comes to the relative position of Vedānta and Śaivism.

7 *yat te kuryur na tat kuryād yad brūyus tat samācaret* See TĀ 4.244 with Viveka and 37.9.

congruent devotion to Śiva, as represented by the Śaivism of the Purāṇas on the one hand, and Tantric Śaivism on the other. The word "Śaiva" for the latter then does not mean "a worshipper of Śiva", but one who follows a scripture taught by Śiva.[8] This distinction is crucial, because the fact that some Śaivas adhered to a system of worship with a predominantly female pantheon was not sufficient to rank them in a different religious category.[9]

These are however only outlines that facilitate the understanding of the complicated processes of adaptation on both sides. For, in reality, the distinctions are blurred by attempts on the side of these Tantric traditions to subsume Vedic religion, as well as by the efforts of the more conservative to integrate Tantrism into orthodoxy; the most striking example for the latter is probably the cult of the Śrīvidyā which, although it started as a scripture associated with the Bhairava canon, was integrated into the system propagated by the Śaṅkarite order at Śṛṅgeri, which is today one of the safeguards of orthodox Hinduism.[10]

If we exclude the Śaivism of the Purāṇas and the Śivadharma, we arrive at a twofold distinction, namely between the so-called Atimārga and the Mantramārga. The Atimārga is more or less identical with Pāśupata Śaivism of different kinds, whereas the Mantramārga contains Tantric Śaivism with its subdivisions.[11] In Abhinavagupta's time the main distinction within Tantric Śaivism was the dichotomy that subsisted within the Mantramārga between the (Śaiva-)Siddhānta and the non-dualistic schools.[12] The Siddhānta adhered

---

8 See SANDERSON (1996), who refers to *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.3.101, 4.2.59 and 4.2.64. The derivation would be something like the following: *śivena proktam = śaivam, śaivam adhīte = śaivaḥ*.

9 See SANDERSON (1990a), p.128, and commentary on *191cd–194ab*. Unfortunately the matter is complicated by the doctrine of a non-dualism of power (*śāktādvaita*) that was propagated by some Śaivas, but was contested by others. Saiddhāntikas like Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha unsurprisingly deny that Śāktas are still Śaivas (Vṛtti on *Mṛgendratantra*, caryāpāda, 1.2). But also Somānanda, in the third chapter of his *Śivadṛṣṭi*, criticises those Śaivas, who are "*śaktivādinaḥ*": if power is, out of devotion, extolled as if it were the highest deity, this is, as he says, unproblematic, because Śiva and Śakti are inseparable. But he too makes the point that some Śāktas are no more Śaivas, despite being rooted in the same tradition and being non-dualists! If we look at *Bṛhadvimarśinī*, vol. 3, p. 331, where Abhinavagupta glosses *viśeṣadarśana* as *śāktādvaita*, we can only conclude with SANDERSON that the core of Abhinavagupta's philosophy must be called Śākta and that much of his exegetical effort is devoted to veiling this fact.

10 See SAWAI (1992).

11 For the following, see SANDERSON (1995), p. 19f.

12 In this thesis the term Siddhānta refers to the Kashmirian predecessors of the Tamilian Śaiva Siddhānta, i.e. to Sadyojyotis, Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha and Rāmakaṇṭha II (*sadyojyotiḥpāda-*

to a strictly dualist doctrine according to which Śiva is merely the efficient cause of the world, and remains without contact to the lower and impure levels of the universe. He is distinct from the souls and the world. "The soul is all-pervasive, eternal and equals Śiva, [but] its Śiva-nature is obstructed by *mala*. With its Śiva-nature confined by that, it cannot know or act without a means. This [soul] which is dependent on means of experience acquires [for that reason a further] bond which is called *māyā* and consists [of the *tattvas*] *kalā* etc. [which are their products]. *Māyā* is the womb of the world."[13] Since *mala* was conceived of as a substance, it could, according to the Saiddhāntikas, only be removed through an action: the ritual of initiation which removes the veil and secures final liberation at death with the falling away of the remaining bonds. For Abhinavagupta's non-dualist school the soul is identical with Śiva and has only to recognize this fact in an act of intuition in order to be liberated. All the distinctions made by the Siddhānta are ultimately unreal, for there is only the one reality called Śiva. Whereas the dualistic Siddhānta rejected the non-dualistic schools, the latter included the former as a lower form of revelation. The inclusivist hierarchy of Abhinavagupta's school aimed at explaining the whole spectrum of 'religions', since it included not only the Pāśupatas and the Siddhānta, but also Buddhist philosophy, Yoga and the like. In theory the relative position of a religion could be deduced from its doctrinal standpoint,[14] but – in the case of Śaiva schools – more importantly from its basic ritual structure. If we rank the Śaiva cults according to increasing heterodoxy, we can see that the defining characteristic in their pantheon is the degree to which female and ferocious deities come to the foreground. On the lower end of the scale, in the Siddhānta, only the consortless mild Sadāśiva is

---

rāmakaṇṭhanārāyaṇakaṇṭhāghoraśivādivākyānusāreṇa .... *Śataratnasaṃgraha*, p. 2). It must be emphasized that the distinction is not between a Northern Tantric Śaivism and a Southern Āgamic Śaivism. Nor is it the case that "Āgama" refers to dualistic scriptures and "Tantra" to monistic ones, neither by meaning, nor by their relative frequency in the primary literature (GOODALL (1995), p. xiv). Both are in fact interchangeable terms that are merely differentiated by the second meaning of *āgama*, namely in the sense of *āgama-pramāṇa* (see below), and by the pejorative use of 'Tantra' for magic. Nor is it true that there is a geographical distinction between dualistic and non-dualistic schools: there is also a South-Indian Krama and Trika (SANDERSON (1990b), p. 80).

13 *ātmā vyāpako nityaḥ śivasamaḥ | tasya śivatvasaṃnirodhako malaḥ | tena pratibad-dhaśivatvo 'sau nopāyaṃ vinā jñeyaṃ kṛtyaṃ vā jñātuṃ kartuṃ vā śaknoti | tasyāpi bhogopāyāpekṣasya māyākhyo bandhaḥ kalādikaḥ pratipadyate | māyā jagadyoniḥ* |, Sadyojyotis on *Svāyaṃbhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 2.

14 The doctrines are ranked and correlated with the ascending order of *tattvas* (SANDERSON (1986), p. 172).

worshipped – his power being personified in his throne – ; in the Krama, the most heterodox of the Kashmirian cults of our author's time, the ritual centres on groups of female, ferocious deities. We arrive at the following sequence: the Siddhānta; the cult of Netranātha represented by the *Netratantra*;[15] the cult of Svacchandabhairava based on the authority of the *Svacchandatantra*;[16] the Trika with its sub-levels; and finally the Krama.[17] The internal logic of this series is the notion that an increase of heterodoxy marks an increase of power and soteriological efficacy.[18] One might wonder why Abhinavagupta did not base his exegesis on the Krama, which is on the top end of the scale of esotericism, but on the Trika. The reason is probably that the Krama would stand in too glaring contradiction to the Siddhānta to be a convincing model for the whole Śaiva revelation, whereas the Trika with its multitude of levels[19] could be seen to encompass a variety of cults.

It is true that the esoteric Śaivas saw their non-dualistic theory and practice as a mode that was superior to the Śaiva-Siddhānta, and even more so to the Vedic religion. But this superiority was apparently not something to be demonstrated by directly challenging "external" religion; according to the famous dictum that one should be "inwardly a Kaula, a Śaiva to the outside and a Vaidika in one's daily life",[20] one was supposed to keep one's true religious identity secret. Since Tantric practice was essentially private and not a cult performed in the temple, the actual practice of an initiate would not be observed by the public. In other words, the practitioner envisaged by Abhinavagupta would probably have been known to be an initiated Śaiva, but would not appear different from other Śaiva Brahmins. He would regard himself to be beyond the limitations to which his peers were subjected, but he would not upset them by obviously violating their social code; he would be sure that his liberation would not depend, for instance, on him remaining pure by not eating with outcasts, but he would probably not advocate such a behaviour.

The term Śaivism is thus used collectively for two types of religious systems, Vedic and Tantric. For the orthodox any Tantric practice was to be rejected on the grounds that it disqualified for orthopraxy by ritually removing caste in initiation (*jātyuddharaṇa*),[21] and that their ritual overstepped the boundaries of pu-

---

15 BRUNNER (1974).

16 ARRAJ (1988).

17 See SANDERSON (1995), p. 78–83, for the increasing antinomianism in this series of cults.

18 See SANDERSON (1985).

19 See SANDERSON (1997).

20 See commentary on *191cd–194ab*.

21 The argument reported by Yāmunācārya is analogous: tantric *dīkṣā* proves that the

rity, namely by contact with people of lower castes and by eating and drinking impure substances. For the more esoteric Tantric Śaivas this insistence on purity was not only ultimately invalid, but also the very cause for bondage and therefore to be transcended. Again, these are distinctions that enable us to understand the mechanism of mutual adaptation and rejection; in reality we may not even find two completely separate and mutually opposing systems of worship, namely Vaidika and Tāntrika, at any time in history, but a variety of compromises. If we take, for instance,[22] the Kaula injunction to offer and drink alcohol at the daily ritual we can see, even in our author's time, different approaches and reactions: on the one hand the Kaula attitude itself, according to which the status of the practitioner depends on the consumption of alcohol, just as the status of the orthodox on the avoidance of it; then a form of compromise, in which water is substituted for alcohol, and finally the rejection of this watered-down practice by the Kaulas themselves. In other words, we might, on the level of theoretical discourse, always find the whole spectrum between ortho- and heteropraxy, mutual adaption and rejection.[23]

1.1 The Validity of Non-vedic Revelation

We saw that the defining characteristic of Tantric Śaivism was a canon of scriptures that was different from Vedic revelation (*śruti*) and from the group of sect-neutral scriptures (*smṛti*). The texts in this canon were called Tantras and, with the connotation of providing the highest authority, Āgamas. Just as

---

Pañcarātra is *vedabāhya. upanayanādisaṃskṛtānāṃ bhagavadārādhanārthatayā dīkṣālakṣaṇasaṃskāravidhānād avaidikatvam iti*, *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, p. 105. Similarly in the case of the Śaivas: *kiṃca śaivādayo vedasiddhavarṇāśramād bahiḥ | kalpayanty āśramādīni tato 'pi śrutibāhyatā |*, *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, p. 96.

22 See commentary on *42–45*.

23 Even a contemporary introduction to a handbook of Śrīvidyā worship introduces the five *makāras* as the difficult path through which the devotee can easily fall and therefore advocates the "pure worship" taught by Śaṅkara, so-called because all impure elements are substituted by unproblematic ones: fruit-juice for alcohol and the like. See introduction to *Śrīkarapātrasvāmi-viracitā Śrīvidyā-varivasyā*. Ed. Dattātreyānandanāthaḥ. Vārāṇāsī: Śrīvidyāsādhanapīṭham saṃvat 2048, p. 29f: *tantraśāstroṃ meṃ 'madya, māṃsa, matsya, mudrā, aur maithuna' ina pañca makāroṃ se pūjana kā vidhāna varṇita hai | …parantu yaha baḍā hī kaṭhina mārga hai | isameṃ kiñcit bhī asāvadhānī hone se niścita hī patana ho jātā hai | …isake sthāna para dugdha, phalarasa tathā sugandhi dravyoṃ se miśrita sāttvika dravyoṃ se arcana karanā hi hitakāraka hai | isase patana kā bhaya nahīṃ hai aura sarvatomukhī kalyāṇa hī hotā hai | jagadguru ādya śaṅkarācārya ke dvārā pravarttita tantra-mārga meṃ sāttvika upāsanā kā upadeśa hai …*.

the claim to superiority was inherent in the self-description of the dualistic system as Siddhānta,[24] i.e. "valid doctrine", or "the definite answer to all other systems",[25] the word Āgama suggested that texts that were revealed by Śiva could claim highest authority. The definition of the word *āgama* or *śabda* in logic[26] as instruction by someone trustworthy was applied to the scriptures spoken by Śiva, Viṣṇu, Sūrya etc.

Despite all considerations of hierarchy within the Śaiva revelation and attacks on the dualistic Siddhānta, Tantric Śaivism as a whole had to assert its validity against Vedic orthodoxy and we fortunately have a witness of this process only one century before Abhinavagupta. The Kashmirian logician Jayanta Bhaṭṭa deals with the validity of non-vedic revelations in two of his works, the *Nyāyamañjarī* (āhnika 4, āgamaprāmāṇyanirūpaṇam) and the *Āgamaḍambara*.[27] Jayanta Bhaṭṭa was in favour of an acceptance of the Śaiva Āgamas, but describes several hypothetical positions with regard to the validity of different Āgamas, including those of the Buddhists. Even the least compromising position that demands congruence to the Veda for any scripture to be valid and therefore excludes Buddhist scripture does not reject the Śaivāgamas:

> "But the scriptures other [than Śruti and Smṛti] that are thought to be valid,[28] of which we know (*yāni paridṛśyante*), are of two kinds: some proceed in complete contradiction to the Veda – like those of the Buddha etc. – , others through teaching rites that are formed without contradiction to it[29] – like those taught by Śiva etc. Among these we teach the validity of the Śaiva scriptures [for the following reasons:] we do not perceive the many defilements that are the cause for doubt and contradiction in the knowledge created by it; it is proved by the Smṛti and inference that they too were created by God; it is impossible to imagine another cause [for them] like greed, delusion etc; [...] and they do not exist in opposition to the Veda, because they do not discard the activities [peculiar] to the four

24 *siddhāntaśabdaḥ paṅkajādiśabdavad yogarūḍhyā śivapraṇīteṣu kāmikādiṣu daśāṣṭadaśasu tantreṣu prasiddhaḥ*, *Ratnatrayollekha* 10–12.

25 *siddhānta eva siddhāntāḥ pūrvapakṣās tataḥ pare* | *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* 11ab.

26 According to the *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.7: *āptopadeśaḥ śabdaḥ*.

27 For a detailed discussion of Jayanta's position, see WEZLER (1976).

28 *āgama* here means 'potential' Āgamas, scriptures the validity of which is to be examined.

29 At the moment I see no other possibility than to construe *kalpita-* with the preceding instrumental. One could also consider emending to *kalpavratāntaropadeśīni* and construe the instrumental adverbially.

> castes and other [rules] known from the Veda."[30]

The author then discusses other, more inclusivist models that hold the Buddhist and even all Āgamas as valid and there is – as far as I can see – no clear statement of the author's opinion up to this point. Only an objection points the way to Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's conclusion: "If the validity of all Āgamas is proved in this way, then even I might compose an Āgama today and even its validity would be recognized within a few days."[31] Someone might also try to cheat people by proclaiming something "written in an old manuscript as a great Āgama."[32] Antiquity is therefore not useful in establishing validity and the criteria that our author considers appropriate are the following:

> "Those scriptures that have acquired fame among a large number of respectable persons, that have been accepted by many people of high learning, that do not appear unprecedented although they thrive [only] these days, that are not motivated by greed etc., that people do not detest, the validity of those scriptures is accepted here."[33]

He then refers to the *nīlāmbaravrata* as "a doctrine of procurers which cannot be tolerated."[34] This sect, whose practice it was to copulate more or less publicly – only wrapped in a black blanket – must, according to Jayanta, have been created by lechers and has therefore been prohibited by the king as unprecedented. This corroborates the *Āgamaḍambara*'s description of the settlement of a religious conflict in Kashmir during Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's lifetime.[35] If this play is a more or less historical description of this religious controversy, then Jayanta

---

30 *yāni punar āgamāntarāṇi paridṛśyante, tāny api dvividhāni – kānicit sarvātmanā vedavirodhenaiva pravartante bauddhādivat | kānicit tadavirodhenaiva kalpitavratāntaropadeśīni śaivādivat || tatra śaivāgamānāṃ tāvat prāmāṇyaṃ brūmahe, tadupajanitāyāḥ pratīteḥ saṃdehabādhakāraṇakāluṣyakalāpasvānupalambhāt | īśvarakartṛkatvasya tatrāpi smṛtyanumānābhyāṃ siddhatvāt | mūlāntarasya lobhamohādeḥ kalpayitum aśakyatvāt, …na ca vedapratipakṣatayā teṣām avasthānaṃ vedaprasiddhacāturvarṇyādivyavahārāparityāgāt*, *Nyāyamañjarī*, p. 635.

31 *sarvāgamaprāmāṇatve nanv evam upapādite | aham apy adya yat kiṃcid āgamaṃ racayāmi cet || tasyāpi hi pramāṇatvaṃ dinaiḥ katipayair bhavet* , *Nyāyamañjarī*, p. 648.

32 *jaratpustakalikhitaṃ yad api tad api kiṃcid idānīṃ kenāpi dhūrtena prakhyāpyate – mahān ayam āgama iti* |, ibid., p. 648.

33 *mahājanasamūhe* [=ms. *kha*] *ye prasiddhiṃ prāpur āgamāḥ | kṛtaś ca bahubhir yeṣāṃ śiṣṭair iha parigrahaḥ || adya pravartamānāś ca nāpūrvā iva bhānti ye | yeṣāṃ na mūlaṃ lobhādi yebhyo nodvijate janaḥ || teṣāṃ eva pramāṇatvam āgamānām iheṣyate* |, ibid., p. 648–649.

34 *na mṛṣyate tu yat kiṃcit pramāṇaṃ kuṭṭanīmatam* ||, *Nyāyāmañjarī*, p. 649.

35 See RAGHAVAN's introduction to his edition of this work for a summary.

Bhaṭṭa's opinion could be a representative outside view of Tantric Śaivism not too far from Abhinavagupta's lifetime.

How the Siddhānta viewed the same issue in Abhinavagupta's time can be gleaned from Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's works. He reiterates an argument that is also used by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa: "Thus it would follow that the Vedas are to be accepted as valid only because they are composed by an omniscient being and therefore all Āgamas would be valid."[36] And he adds: "This is true. Even they are valid sources of knowledge, but they are not created by an omniscient being, because of their mutual contradiction."[37] For Rāmakaṇṭha even scriptures that are taught by beings not equipped with omniscience can be valid, but only scriptures taught by the omniscient Śiva are not contradicted by other doctrines. We may assume that the proof for this is the one already given by Sadyojyotis: "The Śaiva [scripture] is one that elucidates the particular nature of Paśu, Pāśa and other [doctrines[38]], and is uncontradicted [...]."[39] Thus the Śaivaśāstra is the supreme revelation, because it cannot be contradicted by others. Abhinavagupta would probably agree, but for him the relationship between the levels inside Śaivism is regulated by the doctrine of "general" (*sāmānya*) and "special" (*viśeṣa*) scriptures, according to which any rule of a more special scripture would cancel a conflicting rule of the more general one. And here the Siddhānta is of course on a comparatively general level.

Before dealing with the details of his theology of revelation, we shall summarize the pan-Śaiva account of the creation of the Śāstra by Śiva.

1.2 Śiva's 'Body'

It is difficult to ascertain how Śaiva theology conceived the production of scripture by Śiva, i.e. to which degree the abstract description given by Abhinavagupta in the *Vārttika* was meant to evoke the popular image of Śiva speaking to Pārvatī.[40] Although such a model of communication is inherent in the dialogue form of the Tantras and in the accounts of the descent of the Śāstra into

36 *evaṃ tarhi vedādīnām api sarvajñapraṇītatvenaiva prāmāṇyābhyupagamāt sarvāgamaprāmāṇyaprasaṅgaḥ* | *Mataṅgaparameśvara*, vidyāpāda, 3.20ab.

37 *satyam | tāny api pramaṇāny eva | na tu sarvajñaprayuktāni parasparavirodhāt* |, ibid.

38 The previous and next verse makes it clear that *paśu/pāśa-dṛṣṭi* is meant.

39 *paśupāśādivaiśiṣṭyaprakāśakam abādhitam* | *śaivaṃ tadadhikārthatvād viduṣaḥ kasya na priyam* | *Mokṣakārikā* 143cd–144ab.

40 See *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 3.12.34ff. for a description of Brahma's four faces as the source of the Vedas etc.

the human realm through different divine and semi-divine beings, it is also clear that the mythology of deities plays no important role in Tantric Śaivism. Basically Tantric Śaiva practice is not a cult of images, but a cult of mantras and consequently the descriptions of aspects of deities do not involve mythology as known from Purāṇas.[41] For the Śaiva practitioner the iconic form of a deity is subordinate to the mantras that 'express' it.

Consequently Abhinavagupta's depiction of the "five streams (*pañcasrotas*)" of Śaiva revelation as mantras or powers which are the sources of the knowledge that becomes the scriptures, is not an artificially abstract version of a five-headed Śiva teaching an Āgama, but more faithful to his sources than would be a mythological account. For instance the *Mṛgendratantra* describes the body of Śiva that is made of power (*śāktaṃ vapus*) in order to explain how God creates the world as follows:

> "His body, starting from the head, is made of five mantras that are conducive to the five acts, namely Īśāna (*īśa*), Tatpuruṣa, Aghora, Vāma[deva] and Sadyojāta (*aja*)."[42]

In his commentary Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha provides the identification of the five mantras with the five acts and a *nirukti* of *vapus*. He also adds, in his commentary on the next verse, a quotation from the *Pauṣkaratantra* according to which the purpose of Śiva's body is to present the practitioner with an object for his worship. The text then describes how the five mantras form Śiva's body:

> "The supreme quality through which he governs the whole universe is called [figuratively] the head, because it occupies a similarly high position;[43] it is not a part of the body.[44]

---

41 Compare for instance the description of the five faces given below with the *Śivapurāṇa*'s account of the descent of the five faces, in which they are treated as mythological manifestations of Śiva; *Śivapurāṇa*, p. 204 (=Śatarudrasaṃhitā, 1. chapter: *pañcabrahmāvatāravarṇana*).

42 *tadvapuḥ pañcabhir mantraiḥ pañcakṛtyopayogibhiḥ* || *īśatatpuruṣāghoravāmājair mastakādikam* |, *Mṛgendratantra*, vidyāpāda, 1.3.8cd–9ab. Similar passages could probably be found in most Tantras of the Siddhānta, see, for instance, *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, vidyāpāda, 4.14–15ab, and in an unpublished recension of the *Kālottaratantra*, called *Jñānapañcāśikā*: *īśaṃ vaktraṃ tathāghoraṃ guhyaṃ cājātasaṃjñakaṃ* | *pañcavaktrāṇi devasya* ..., folio 1^{v}, NGMPP B 118/7 ("Kālottaratantra").

43 Lit.: "because it is in the same place as the head".

44 *īṣṭe yena jagat sarvaṃ guṇenoparivartinā* | *sa mūrdhasamadeśatvān mūrdhā nāvayavas tanoḥ* |, ibid. 9cd–10ab.

Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha notes that the 'quality', i.e. the mantra of *īśāna*, is supreme, because it is the topmost of all the streams of Śaiva scripture with their subdivisions, and therefore resembles the head. The subsequent verses up to 15 describe the other parts of the 'body' of the ultimately bodiless God.

It is conspicuous that the Tantra itself tries to empty the names of the parts of the body through *nirvacana*s of their literal meaning: the 'head' is not really a part of the body, but only *īśāna* functioning as the supreme. This approach, which we rather expect from a philosopher who wishes to reinterpret terms to fit his own reading of the doctrine, is in fact quite appropriate for this theology, in which deities are first of all mantras. Only in a second step are these mantras used to create a form for the formless Śiva, be it for the benefit of the practitioner, or for Śiva himself in order to manifest the world, or to create the scriptures. In other words, one talks of the mantras as faces, not vice versa.

The connection between the names (*īśāna, tatpuruṣa, aghora, vāmadeva* and *sadyojāta*) and the parts of the body in the construction of Śiva's form becomes clear, when we look at the form of these mantras:

oṃ hoṃ īśānamūrdhne namaḥ
oṃ heṃ tatpuruṣavaktrāya namaḥ
oṃ huṃ aghorahṛdayāya namaḥ
oṃ hiṃ vāmadevaguhyāya namaḥ
oṃ haṃ sadyojātamūrtaye namaḥ[45]

Since these mantras are used to purify the corresponding parts of the body by dusting them with ash,[46] they are, from the perspective of the ritual, indeed associated with parts of the worshipper's, and therefore Śiva's, body.

This pentad is correlated with many other sets of five, like the 'five acts': creation (*sṛṣṭi*), persistence (*sthiti*), resorption (*saṃhāra*), obscuration (*tirodhāna*), and showing grace (*anugraha*) through bestowing liberation. Especially the correlation to the five "cause-deities" (*kāraṇeśvara*) is important

---

45 See BRUNNER (1986), p. 93. KREISEL (1986), p. 59, fn. 190, has tried to explain the sequence starting with Īśāna as a reversal of the Vedic sequence (starting with Sadyojāta) in order to suit the cremation ritual. It is in fact the normal form of these mantras in Tantric Śaivism.

46 See *Somaśambhupaddhati*, 1.39: *īśatatpuruṣāghoraguhyakājātaśambaraiḥ* | *krameṇoddhūlayen mūrdhavaktrahṛdguhyavigrahān* || On *śambaraiḥ* the editors of the text in the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies note "*mantrair ity arthaḥ*" (Karmakanda-kramavali by Somashambhu, ed. J.D. ZADOO, Srinagar 1947, KSTS 73) and it seems that nothing else can be meant here: this sense is however not recorded in the dictionaries.

for the treatment of the *pañcasrotas* in the *Vārttika*. The *Svacchandatantra* derives it as follows: according to 11.33–36 the transcendent Śiva is completely pure and omnipresent like space. Beneath this formless and all-pervading Śiva are other deities with a limited 'pervasion', which means that they are situated lower in the hierarchy of the *tattvas*. They pervade all levels below them, but are pervaded by Śiva. These 'causal deities' (*kāraṇadevatā*) are then described:

> "But now I will summarily teach how far the 'cause' [deities] pervade [the universe].[47] Brahmā is presiding over the element earth, Viṣṇu over the element water, Rudra over fire, Īśvara over air and Sadāśiva over space.[48]

Kṣemarāja adds that a similar identification can be made with the five *kalās*[49] and the text supplies a further set of identifications that are not relevant here. Then, in verses 40cd–41, the five *kāraṇeśvaras* are correlated to the five *brahmans*, and in vs. 42 the four horizontal faces (i.e. except the Īśānā face which is directed upwards) with the four Vedas, so that the following picture emerges:

direction	*brahma/face*	*kāraṇa*	*scripture*
west	Sadyojāta	Brahmā	Ṛgveda
north	Vāmadeva	Viṣṇu	Yajurveda
south	Aghora	Rudra	Sāmaveda
east	Tatpuruṣa	Īśvara	Atharva
zenith	Īśāna	Sadāśiva	'*sarvavidyātmaka*'

This is followed by another set of identifications with the same names for the faces:

---

47 In his commentary Kṣemarāja adds a note that here only the lower form of these 'causes' as being five is described and that another list earlier in the text which had started with *anāśritaśiva* – and has therefore six instead of five – is therefore not contradicted. Statements like these can be understood as attempts to resolve inconsistencies which in reality are caused by careless, or hesitant redaction of the text and one might hope to unravel the redactional history of these texts by analysing these statements: cf. ARRAJ (1988). But the assumption of a coherent archetype may be futile: a specific Tantra may have always existed as a compilation of authoritative, but possibly conflicting accounts of Śaiva theory and practice.

48 *kāraṇānāṃ punar vyāptiṃ kathayāmi samāsataḥ | tattve tu pārthive brahmā adhiṣṭhātā vyavasthitaḥ || aptattve tu sthito viṣṇū rudras tejasi saṃsthitaḥ | īśvaro vāyutattve tu ākāśe tu sadāśivaḥ ||*, *Svacchandatantra* 11.37–38.

49 See tables below.

Sadyojāta	*laukikaṃ vijñānam*
Vāmadeva	*vaidikam*
Aghora	*adhyātmikam*
Tatpuruṣa	*atimārgākhyam*
Īśāna	*mantrākhyam*

We will see that the *mantramārga* ('*mantrākhya*') is again divided into five parts, but the text gives no clue as to how we are to understand the relationship between these sets of five faces. Are they to be identified, so that, for instance, the same Sadyojāta is the source for the Ṛgveda and for 'worldly knowledge'? In some sense this may be correct, because the fivefold structure remains the basis of diversity and further multiplication would surely be seen as an internal differentiation, but on the other hand one has to conclude that the two sets of five faces form a hierarchy: the Īśāna in our first list was described as 'consisting of all knowledge' (*sarvavidyātmaka*),[50] which can only be explained as a summary of the next set. In the case of the next Īśāna, who is said to be the source of the *mantramārga* (*mantrākhya*), the same principle must be applied, for the *mantramārga* falls into five groups that are again associated to Sadyojāta etc. As far as I could see, none of the sources preceding Abhinavagupta specify how many sets of five faces are to be assumed for the explanation of scripture, and our author uses the doctrine of a further subdivision of the five more to hint at an infinite variety of scriptures, rather than to formulate a doctrine of more than five 'streams'. But some later sources proceeded further in this direction by determining the number of 'streams' as twenty-five, i.e. five five-fold faces.

The issue of a hierarchy of faces is further complicated by iconographical considerations. Sadāśiva is depicted as five-headed in sculpture and painting, but the fifth face, Īśāna, often remains invisible,[51] which means that the higher and more pervasive may be indicated by a lack of form. There may not be a hard and fast rule for sculptors in this matter, but this suggests that the doctrinal background of a specific number of heads may be difficult to determine. If we were to construct an image that would arrange the hierarchy of faces and corresponding doctrines in the *Svacchanda* passage quoted above, we would not be able to take the change of perspectives into account: viewed from below the first Īśāna would be a single head as the source of 'all knowledge' (*sarvavidātmaka*); from above the same Īśāna would not be *one* face, but five. The resulting image with two tiers of faces would ideally have ten faces, but in fact only nine could be

50 This correlation follows naturally from the (Vedic) *brahmamantra* of Īśāna, which starts: "*īśānaḥ sarvavidyānām* ...." Cf. also *Śrīkaṇṭhī* 104c.

51 See KREISEL (1986) (p. 64, fn. 204) and SHARMA (1976).

depicted, since the lower Īśāna would lose its identity as one head.[52] This speculation shows that unless one were to produce a holographic image of Sadāśiva where the Īśāna could be one or five according to perspective, there might be an insuperable incongruence between the concept of different sets of five faces and the sculptor's practice, and our attempts to correlate specific doctrines with specific images may be fundamentally flawed.[53]

Before discussing the accounts of the creation of the Śaivatantras we shall summarize the various correlations of the five faces with other hierarchies in Abhinavagupta's Trika. In the fifteenth chapter of the *Tantrāloka* he explains how the six directions in space evolve out of the uniform reality Śiva, who is conceived of as the light of consciousness (*prakāśa*):

> As Lord Sadāśiva has the five *mantras* as his body, the points of compass evolve from the division into Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa (*nṛ*), Aghora, Vāmadeva, Sadyojāta and the lower face. Īśāna is above, as he consists of light. The eastern face is Tatpuruṣa [as it is] spreading out. Aghora (*acaṇḍaḥ*) is the southern [direction]. Vāma is pleasant (*saumyakaḥ*) [and] the northern; Sadyojāta is taught as the western as he is turned away. The face [turned] to the subterranean paradise is the lower as it exists without light.[54]

The faces are here naturally arranged in space by their relative position to the light of the sun and this description may seem commonplace, but – as will become clear in the *Vārttika* – is in fact an elegant attempt to subject the five, or six faces to another element, namely "light".

The following table summarizes the correspondences of the five faces with other hierarchies:[55]

---

52 If we include the differentiation of the *mantramārga* we would theoretically arrive at three tiers with five each, i.e. fifteen, but only thirteen could be depicted in a three-dimensional medium.

53 Still, the Śaiva doctrine of twenty-five streams of knowledge will explain a twenty-five headed Śiva better than the reference to the twenty-five *tattvas* of the Sāṃkhya system (KREISEL (1986), p. 64, fn. 204).

54 *kramāt sadāśivādhīśaḥ pañcamantratanur yataḥ | īśanraghoravāmākhyasadyodhobhedato diśaḥ | īśa ūrdhvaṃ prakāśatvāt, pūrvaṃ vaktraṃ prasāri yat || puruṣo, dakṣiṇācaṇḍo, vāmā vāmas tu saumyakaḥ | parāṅmukhatayā sadyaḥ paścimā paribhāṣyate || pātāla-vaktram adharam aprakāśatayā sthiteḥ* ,, TĀ 15.203cd–206ab.

55 See also BRUNNER-LACHAUX (1963), Appendix VI, where more identifications are given. For the correspondence with the elements, see TĀ 15.207 and 11.20, *Svacchandatantra* 11.37cd–38; with the *pañcakṛtyas*, see *Mṛgendratantra*, vidyāpāda, 1.3.8cd–9ab.

vaktra	*īśāna*	*tatpuruṣa*	*aghora*	*vāmadeva*	*sadyojāta*
kalā	śāntyātītā	śānti	vidyā	pratiṣṭhā	nivṛttiḥ
bhūta	ākāśa	vāyu	tejas	ap	pṛthivī
kāraṇa	sadāśiva	īśvara	rudra	viṣṇu	brahman
śakti	jñāna	cid	kriyā	ānanda	icchā
kṛtya	anugraha	tirobhāva	saṃhāra	sthiti	sṛṣṭi

Many other correspondences between the five *brahmans* or faces of Śiva could be added, with the castes,[56] the parts of mantras like *oṃ* and *namaḥ śivāya*[57] etc., but having shown through the preceding examples their importance for structuring important coordinates of the Śaiva universe, we may now turn to the hierarchy of Śaiva revelation that is connected to the five faces.

1.3 The Structure of the Śaiva Canon

A rather late but convenient summary of Siddhānta doctrine, the *Śataratna-saṃgraha*, gives an account of the origination of the Tantras:

> "At the time of creation Śiva creates pure knowledge characterized by five streams in order to make known the goals of man."[58]

The commentary says that the five streams are the upper, the eastern, the southern, the northern and the western, and that knowledge is thus divided by this five-fold form of Sadāśiva, i.e. his five faces. Following the twofold division of knowledge, the higher one in the form of "understanding" or "realization", and the lower one in the form of "doctrine", the commentary says that in the first step 'sound' (*nāda*) is produced from the formless Śiva and then the Tantras from Sadāśiva whose form is that with five faces. But in fact there are twenty-five streams, if we include the lower faces of Sadāśiva, for we have to imagine a deity with five five-fold faces. Here the lower set of five faces are the source of worldly doctrine (*laukika*), the Vedas, *adhyātmika*, the Atimārga and

56 *Siddhāntaśikhopaniṣat*, in: Unpublished Upaniṣads, ed. Kunhan Raja, Adyar 1933, p. 380ff.

57 ibid., p. 381. Also in: Śivatattva Ratnākara of Basavarāja of Keḷadi, Vol. 1, Mysore: Oriental Research Institute 1964, p. 47f. (*sadyojāto nakāraś ca vāmadevo makārakaḥ śikāro 'ghorasaṃyukto vakāraḥ puruṣas tathā || sadāśivo yakāraś ca pañcavaktraṃ prakīrtitam | īśānaḥ puruṣaś caiva aghoro vāmadevakaḥ || sadyojātaś ca pañcaiva kalā brahma prakīrtitāḥ* |).

58 *sṛṣṭikāle maheśānaḥ puruṣārthaprasiddhaye | vidhatte vimalaṃ jñānaṃ pañcasroto'bhilakṣitam* ||. Quoting *Mṛgendratantra*, vidyāpāda, 1.1.23.

the Mantramārga.[59] These streams therefore encompass all forms of knowledge.[60]

Being the source of Tantric Śaivism (*mantramārga*), the upper, fifth face is of course of primary interest and therefore often the only one mentioned. The five faces of this upper face are arranged in the same way according the points of the compass plus one directed upwards. With their respective names, the correlating scriptures and their characteristics they are the following:[61]

direction	*face*	*tantra*	*description of the tantra*
zenith	īśāna	siddhānta	granting liberation
east	tatpuruṣa	gāruḍa	destroying all kinds of poison
north	vāmadeva	vāma	acquiring magical control over everything
west	sadyojāta	bhūta	warding of spirits and planetary influences
south	aghora	bhairava	destroying enemies

As the worshipper is facing east, the northern face is called *vāma* in the sense of "left", the Aghora-face is on the "right" side. "*dakṣiṇa-tantra*" is therefore synonyous with *bhairavatantra*.[62] We shall not deal here with the names of the Tantras involved, as they play no role in the *Vārttika*.[63]

From the above account we can see that whereas the four lower faces are the source of scriptures that are devoted to temporary results with which a liberation-seeker could not wholly identify, the upper face is reserved for the scriptures of the Siddhānta. The monists contested the view that the dualist's interpretation of these scriptures was correct, but could only do so with the help of "higher" Tantras that provided them with the necessary exegetical

59 The interpretation of these terms is disputed; see TĀV 13.346cd for a forced reinterpretation. For the idea that, for instance, even an Upaniṣat is taught by Śiva, see PTV, p. 71: *yathoktam* …[quoting Kaṭhopaniṣat] *iti vedānte parameśvareṇa*.

60 …*pañcasrotobhilakṣitaṃ pañca ca tāni srotāṃsi pañcasrotāṃsi ūrdhvapūrvadakṣiṇottarapaścimānanāni abhitaḥ samantāt lakṣitaṃ prasṛtatvena lakṣitam | sadāśivarūpeṇa kāmikādibhinnadarśanātmatāṃ prāptam iti yāvat | tādṛśaṃ jñānaṃ śāstrarūpaṃ vidhatte nirmimīte | niṣkalāc chivāt avabodharūpaṃ jñānam eva prathamaṃ nādarūpatvena prasṛtam | paścāt sadāśivarūpāt tantrākāratāṃ prāptam ity arthaḥ* | […] *tatra laukikavaidikādhyātmikātimārgikamantrikabhedena sadāśivasya pratimukhaṃ pañcavidhabhinnāni pañcaviṃśatisrotāṃsi bhavanti | teṣv evāntargataṃ sakalaṃ vāṅmayaṃ śāstrajālam* | […], *Śataratnasaṃgraha*, p. 7–8.

61 *tatra māntrikaṃ pañcavidham api krameṇa ūrdhvapūrvakuberavaruṇayāmyasambandhāt muktipradasiddhāntasarvaviṣaharaṇagāruḍasarvavaśīkaraṇavāmabhūtagrahanivārakabhūtatantraśatrukṣayakarabhairavasaṃjñakam* |, *Śataratnasaṃgraha*, p. 9.

62 This is not to be confused with the sixty-four Tantras of the Bhairava division mentioned below!

63 See DYCZKOWSKI (1988), p. 31–55.

repertoire. Their problem was that these "higher" scriptures were associated with the faces of Vāma(deva) and Aghora. Thus an important line of argumentation in the *Vārttika* serves to explain why the Siddhānta that came out of the upper face is not the highest doctrine.

There are many later accounts of the same process, for instance in the first chapter of the *Kāmikāgama*, but it may be enough to quote a passage from the *Śivatattvaratnākara*, a voluminous encyclopedia that has a slightly naive, but rare characterization of the two less important 'streams', namely the eastern and the western.[64]

> "Below [the Īśāna face] are four streams. Through them were created Tantras: [these are] taken seperately the Gāruḍa-, the Dakṣiṇa-, Vāma- and Bhūtatantras.
> Of these it is said that in the Gāruḍatantra one should perform worship of the mantra of Tatpuruṣa and meditate on it in a particular way [?].[65] This Tantra teaches particularly and clearly Mantras and herbs for the cure of poisons, like that of snakes etc.
> In the Dakṣiṇatantra one should meditate on and perform worship of the mantra of Aghora and it is taught that it alone is to be realized. Mantras and their applications are taught there which bring victory over enemies.
> In the Bhūtatantra the might of [the mantra of] Sadyojāta is told as well as mantras and herbs for the pacification of ghosts, spirits, goblins an the like.[66]

1.4 Models of Integration

What must have concerned the theologians that advocated the worship of more heterodox pantheons was the fact that the pan-Śaiva model of revelation with its five streams favoured the Siddhānta. In order to achieve an integration of other

64 Compare also vss. 151cd–270ab of the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* edited in the appendix.

65 Maybe one should rather meditate through *viśeśa*, i.e. Garuḍa?

66 *adhaḥ srotāṃsi catvāri tais tantrāṇi prajajñire* | *gāruḍaṃ dakṣiṇaṃ vāmaṃ bhūtaṃ ceti vibhāgataḥ* || *tatra gāruḍatantre tu brahma tatpuruṣātmakam* | *pūjayitvā viśeṣeṇa dhyātavyam iti kīrtyate* || *tantreṇānena sarpādiviṣāṇāṃ tu cikitsane mantrauṣadhāni proktāni viśeṣeṇa parisphuṭam* || *tantre tu dakṣiṇe 'ghoraṃ brahmeti paribhāvya ca* | *pūjayitvā tad evaikaṃ sākṣātkāryam itīritam* || (*sākṣātkāram itiritam* Ed.) *mantrāḥ prayogās tatroktāḥ śatrūṇāṃ vijayāvahāḥ* | *bhūtatantre tu kathitaṃ sadyojātasya vaibhavam* || *bhūtapretapiśācādiśāntyai mantrauṣadhāni ca* |, *Śivatattvaratnākara*, vol. III, p. 150f, vss. 100–115.

scriptures the doctrine that Sadāśiva's body consists of five mantras[67] and that these mantras are faces which are the source of the five streams of knowledge[68] was extended in two ways.

1.4.1 The Lower face

As shown above the creation of the directions in space is explained with the arrangement of the faces of Śiva, and this, by analogy, demands a sixth face that is directed downwards. The lower face is called *pātālavaktra* (TĀ 15.206a), *picuvaktra* or *yoginīvaktra* and is the source of the Kaula doctrine.[69] In the logic of Abhinavagupta's system the position of this face as outside the normal pentad explains why it transcends the dichotomy of the other faces and is therefore the source of non-dual scriptures:

> "This lower face completely destroys all stains of duality; for when it is worshipped, the multitude of upper and lower [levels] vanishes."[70]

Jayaratha adds that this face is the sixth stream (*srotas*) of revelation, the source of the secret scriptures that teach non-duality.[71]

We know from a quotation from the lost *Triśirobhairavatantra* in the TĀ that this Trika-Tantra knew six streams:

> "Of the Śaiva scripture that has three objects, a twenty-five-fold nature, or a division of ten and eighteen [scriptures], or six streams, it is said here: ..."[72]

---

67 "*pañcamantratanuḥ*" appears in TĀ 15.203d and *Tattvaprakāśa* 6.

68 *pañcasrotomukhaḥ*, see *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* 280c.

69 See DYCZKOWSKI (1988), p. 63ff. One important source that mentions a sixth, lower stream is the *Śrīkaṇṭhī*.

70 *adhovaktraṃ tv idaṃ dvaitakalaṅkaikāntaśātanam || kṣīyate tadupāsāyāṃ yenordhvādharaḍambaraḥ |*, *Tantrāloka* 6.193cd–194ab.

71 *yatra nāmāpānasya viśrāntis tad idaṃ dvaitakalaṅkāpaham adhovaktraṃ ṣaṣṭhasrotorūpaṃ yoginīvaktram ity ucyate yato 'yam advaitārthopadeśināṃ rahasyaśāstrāṇām udayo* ..., TĀV 6.193cd–194ab.

72 *triprameyasya śaivasya pañcapañcātmakasya vā | daśāṣṭādaśabhedasya ṣaṭsrotasa ihocyate ||*, TĀ 28.147. GNOLI (1972), p. 645, and DYCZKOWSKI (1988), p. 166 (fn. 52), understand *śaiva* in the sense of a follower of this doctrine, but this makes sense only for *triprameyasya*. Surely the text means that Śaiva scripture, i.e. *śaivam* in the sense of *śaivaṃ vākyam*, is thus divided. Compare the quotation "*vedāc chaivaṃ* ..." in TĀV 1.18 and SANDERSON (1997); also *Jayadrathayāmala* as quoted in DYCZKOWSKI (1988), p. 200 (fn. 50 and 51).

Here several classifications of the Śaiva revelation are given. Since the passage that follows is quoted from a Trika-tantra, it is not surprising to find that the three categories of the Trika, namely *nara*, *śakti* and *śiva*, are mentioned first.[73] The third refers to the division of the Siddhānta-tantras into two divisions (*bheda*), the ten *Śivatantras* (=*śivabheda*) and eighteen *Rudratantras* (=*rudrabheda*); the last item mentioned, i.e. the division into six streams is interpreted by Jayaratha as the five known to the Siddhānta plus the lower Picuvaktra.[74]

Another acclaimed source that teaches the lower face is the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* which is discussed in the appendix.

1.4.2 Beyond the Higher

In the *Vārttika* Abhinavagupta does not mention the Picuvaktra; here the source for the higher revelation lies above the upper face (Īśāna) and is simply called *ūrdhvordhva*, the one "higher than the upper". This face, which is associated with the female power (*śakti*) of Śiva, is the source of higher scriptures and corresponds to the higher levels inside the Trika, namely the Kula, Kaula and Mata.[75] What is astonishing is that Abhinava does not mention one important source for this idea: the *Jayadrathayāmala*. There we find, in the section analysed by DYCZKOWSKI, a system of six streams which adds a higher stream to the normal five.[76]

1.4.3 Amṛteśa

There is a further scriptural source that could have been adduced by Abhinava for an integration of conflicting pantheons: the *Netratantra*. It contains passages which could be interpreted in a similar way as the *Mālinītantra*'s transcendence of all rules,[77] and there are also good arguments for a nondualist.[78] In chapters 9–12 there is a description of a series of pantheons,

73 For the following, see Jayaratha's commentary on the passage: *tripramevasyeti naraśaktiśivātmakatvāt | pañcapañcātmakasyeti tantraprakriyayā vaktratayā, viśeṣaprakriyayā vāmeśyāditayā ca evaṃrūpasyety arthaḥ | ṣaṭsrotasa iti picuvaktreṇa saha ||*

74 The interpretation of *pañcapañca* is problematic. Jayaratha understands it as the five faces plus the five *vāhas* of the Krama: could it instead be an early reference to five five-fold faces?

75 See SANDERSON (1997) for these terms.

76 DYCZKOWSKI (1988), p. 124.

77 See 8.54cd–57.

78 See 21.20–32ab; 8.39–40.

through which the main deity of this system can be worshipped:[79] the ninth chapter starts with the request by the goddess that Śiva may specify one point taught before, namely how it is that the worship of forms of the deity taught in all the scriptures – the Vāma, Dakṣiṇa and Siddhānta, but also Saura, Vaiṣṇava and Vaidika – can be chosen at will and lead to the desired fruit. The answer is of course that the deity of the Tantra, Amṛteśabhairava, is all-pervading, consists of all the Āgamas and therefore bestows the fruit of all mantras. He is multiform (9.14), like a wish-fulfilling gem: if worshipped as Sadāśiva, he takes on the form of Sadāśiva to bestow the fruit of the worship onto the worshipper (9.16cd–17ab), etc. This inclusivism is then specified through a description of some of these pantheons: in chapter 9 a description of Sadāśiva is given, chapter 10 is a description of Bhairava as worshipped according to the scriptures of the southern stream.

Tumburu's pantheon,[80] which is described in chapter 11, is noteworthy, first because there are not many sources for the Vāmasrotas and, furthermore, because it supplies some parallels to the *Vārttika*. Kṣemarāja's verse that introduces this chapter uses the key words *saubhāgya* and *vamana* that will mark the description of Vāmadeva in the *Vārttika*. Verse 1 of chapter 11 mentions that his mantra grants all "the fruit of all *siddhis*", an expression which occurs also in *185b*. It then goes on to describe the installation of the ten-armed, five faced and three-eyed Tumburu in an eight-petaled lotus, whose five faces should be designed according to the method followed for constructing the form of Sadāśiva, and who is surrounded by his four powers Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī/Ajitā and Aparājitā.

The background for Abhinava's treatment of the left stream in the *Vārttika*[81] is the observation that this stream is concerned with magical power (*siddhi*) and especially with rites for sexual attraction. Interestingly this connection between Tumburu and "desire" emerges from a passage in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*.[82] This Kashmirian narrative provides external evidence not only for the connection of Tumburu with the left current, but also for his association with the deity of the right current, which is one of the features of the Trika's theory of the canon.

The series of pantheons in the *Netratantra* continues in chapter 12 with the Kaula pantheon formed by the eight mothers. Kṣemarāja's introduction repro-

79 See BRUNNER (1974) for a summary.

80 See GOUDRIAAN (1985), p. 19–62 for a collection of material on and detailed analysis of this deity.

81 SANDERSON (1986), p. 188 (fn. 90) and p. 212–214.

82 Or, to be exact, the *Mokṣopāya*, see HANNEDER (1998).

duces the doctrine that the Kula is the undivided essence of the preceding systems, i.e. Siddhānta, Dakṣiṇa and Vāma, but the Tantra itself does not confirm the position of the Kaula, as its inclusivism extends, in chapter 13, to a description of Nārāyaṇa and Sūrya.[83] This explains why the *Netratantra*, despite all parallels, is ignored by Abhinavagupta in the context of the description of the canon: this Tantra is aware of the Vāma, Dakṣiṇa, Trika (13.37–43) and Kaula, but includes them merely as possible forms of the worship of Netranātha. In other words, it is for Abhinanvagupta too near to the truth of the Trika, but too far from his sectarian position.

1.5 Abhinavagupta's Definition of Āgama

In the last chapters of his *Tantrāloka*, Abhinavagupta expounds aspects of his philosophy of Śaiva revelation. Āhnika 35 deals with the "unity of all Śāstras" (vs. 1) as taught by his teacher Śambhunātha (vs. 44). The author starts by defining *āgama* as the basic knowledge (*prasiddhi*) on which every long established activity (*vyavahāra*) depends,[84] and which is a perception that expresses itself into sound, or words (19a). Without such prior knowledge even direct perception would be inconsequential, like that of a hungry child that – without instruction – would not be able to select eatables. So it is that without being aware of it everyone depends on the primary *āgama* that has its source in Śiva. In a parallel in the *Tantrasāra*[85] he adds that, fundamentally, the Śāstras were not divided according to the variety of desired results and the diversity of qualifications (*adhikāra*), but through Śiva's power of limitation people became devoted only to parts of this Ur-Āgama: some to the Veda, where duality predominates; some to the Sāṃkhya or to the Vaiṣṇava scriptures in their fruitless search for liberation; some who hold that the nature of Śiva is separate from the world to the Śaiva-Siddhānta; some who teach the highest deity as omniform to the *Mataṅgatantra*; and very few to the Trika. In this way Śiva leads every soul gradually to the "one fruit", i.e. true liberation, which is that of the Trika.

---

83 DYCZKOWSKI (1988), p. 43, quotes this Tantra for a division into three streams, but this is Kṣemarāja's interpretation.

84 The key term *prasiddhi*, which is, in the same context, used in its primary sense ("renown") by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa (*mahājanasamūhe ye prasiddhiṃ prāpur āgamāḥ*, *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 648), is here reinterpreted. The *Nyāyakośa* gives *jñānam* and *khyātiḥ* as synonyms; GNOLI (1972), p. 762, translates it as "certezza a priori".

85 See chapter 21, p. 193–4.

By way of fragmentation this *prasiddhi* spreads either as an unbroken chain of teacher and disciple (*paramparā*), or as scripture (TĀ 35.15).[86] Although there is only one Āgama, it becomes manifold through its division into different goals, like the four aims of man, but this does not imply internal contradiction (25) and does not falsify its validity. There is, however, a clear hierarchy of these parts so that the higher fruit cannot be attained through the lower doctrines and practices; the adherents, for instance, of the Pañcarātra can only experience what they think to be liberation, whereas true liberation through identity with Śiva is beyond them (29). Thus the whole range of knowledge, starting from worldly knowledge, and including all forms of religion, culminates in the Trika, but the unity of all knowledge can be seen only on the Kula level of the Trika, since the Kula is the essence of all Śāstras (30–34).

Having propounded the descent and abridgment of the original Śāstra in āhnika 36, he draws the conclusion that the lower doctrines, like that of the Veda, are dominated by delusion in order to preserve the world:

> "Since [the lower systems] have perceived a part of the reality of the higher doctrine, but rejected it, we see the nature of delusion in these lower systems, because it protects creation. For instance in the holy Ānandaśāstra it is taught by Śiva that the word of the Ṛṣis [is the cause of] much trouble, produces uncertain and minor result [and is therefore] limited; the wise should not take it as an authority, but resort only to the scripture of Śiva."[87]

But this is not all; for the same reason, i.e. because the Veda is in the domain of delusion, all that goes against it will lead one beyond delusion: "Those very acts that are the cause of sin in the Veda produce rapid result in this doctrine of the left ..."[88] According to SANDERSON *vāmaśāsane* here means the doctrine of the Vāma-srotas, as the *Ānandatantra* which is quoted here, belongs to that part of the canon,[89] and it seems that Abhinavagupta wishes to extend this to

86 This may seem contradictory, as even "scriptural traditions" in India are transmitted often orally, but the verse is an attempt to show that both worldly knowledge, i.e. knowledge not transmitted in a text, as well as the knowledge that is crystallized in a scripture are derived from this primary revelation.

87 *ūrdhvaśāsanavastvaṃśe dṛṣṭvāpi ca samujjhite | adhaḥśāstreṣu māyātvaṃ lakṣyate sargarakṣaṇāt ||9|| śrīmadānandaśāstrādau proktaṃ ca parameśinā | ṛṣivākyaṃ bahukleśam adhruvālpaphalaṃ mitam ||10|| naiva pramāṇayed vidvān śaivam evāgamaṃ śrayet |*

88 *yad ārṣe pātahetukaṃ tad asmin vāmaśāsane ||11|| āśusiddhyai yataḥ sarvam ārṣaṃ māyodarasthitam |* Cf. *Kulārṇavatantra* 5.48ab: *yair eva patanaṃ dravyais siddhis tair eva coditā |*

89 See SANDERSON (1995), p. 86, who refers to *Śrīkaṇṭhī*, vs. 264.

the whole Śaiva revelation by following the more general definition of *vāma* as *saṃsāraviparītaḥ*.[90]

The author continues by dividing the doctrine taught by Śiva into two branches, one transmitted by Śrīkaṇṭha (Tantric Śaivism), the other by Lakuleśvara (Pāśupata-Śaivism) (14). Whereas both grant liberation, only the former has also the capability to grant "enjoyment". The doctrine of Śrīkaṇṭha is fivefold, because of the five powers of Śiva, and is called the "fivefold stream" (16). It falls into three parts, a group of ten and one of eighteen scriptures, and above it are the sixty-four Tantras of the "Bhairava division". In verses 18–24 the system of Pīṭhas is introduced. According to this classification the *Mālinīvijayottara* is the "supreme essence of the *Siddhayogīśvarīmatam*", which is the main scripture of the highest Pīṭha, the Vidyā-Pīṭha. As further support for the supremacy of the *Mālinītantra* he quotes a few verses that introduce another model of explanation which will be used in the *Vārttika*, namely that the essence of all Tantras fused with the left and the right stream is to be found in the Kaula level of the Trika. For that reason the Trika is called "half of six" (*ṣaḍardha*), because its constituent parts are the following three: the sixth stream above Īśāna, i.e. the *ūrdhvordhva*, the left and the right.[91]

It was difficult for the Śaiva Tantrics to be too selective in their choice of individual Tantras as valid, since divine authorship could hardly be rejected in some cases and accepted in others without weakening one's position. One criterion for the validity of the "Āgamas" as a group was their freedom from contradiction (*ekavākyatā*), because otherwise divine authorship would be difficult to uphold. It was therefore crucial that the theoreticians produced an account of the Śaiva canon that would declare all parts as valid, but hierarchize them in a way which would support the claim of one's own group for the highest level. On the level of the scriptures themselves this was done by inserting lists of Tantras into the chapters that deal with the "descent" of the scripture (*tantrāvatāra*).[92] On the level of exegesis it had to be shown that the hierarchy of possibly conflicting Śāstras was logical and intended by Śiva. The Saiddhāntikas had no difficulties in showing that their scriptures – which were associated with the highest face of Śiva – were superior,[93] but the monists who based their philosophy not on the Siddhāntatantras had to find a model to explain why their own Śāstras repre-

90 See *357cd–365ab*.

91 See commentary on *164cd–166*.

92 The relative uniformity of some of these lists can only be interpreted by assuming considerable redaction.

93 Cf. *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* 16.

sented truth more fully. The first section of Abhinavagupta's *Vārttika* describes such a model.

1.6 The Threefold Division

In verses *374–391* of the *Vārttika* Abhinavagupta describes a division of the Śaiva canon into three parts: the *śivabheda* with ten Tantras, the *rudrabheda* with eighteen Tantras and the *bhairavabheda* with sixty-four Tantras. The first two add up to the twenty-eight Āgamas of the Siddhānta[94] that are known from other sources. Abhinavagupta does not dispute the authority of these scriptures, but says that their main aim is to promulgate dualism and dualism-cum-nondualism respectively, whereas the Bhairavatantras teach only nondualism and are therefore a higher form of revelation.

This classificatory system, which is probably extracted from the lists in the *Śrīkaṇṭhīsaṃhitā*,[95] is a rearrangement of the *pañcasrotas* that gives more weight to non-Saiddhāntika scriptures: the first two categories, the *śiva-* and the *rudrabheda* are the Tantras that in the *pañcasrotas* come out of the Īśāna-face, whereas the *bhairavabheda* fuses the Vāma and the Dakṣiṇa.[96]

The conflation of this comparatively early classificatory system with other systems that belong to later literature, or to the literature of radically different schools, has complicated the issue. Firstly, the sixty-four Bhairavatantras are not simply taught by the Aghora-face as are the *dakṣiṇatantras*;[97] if this were stated in a text, it would have to be interpreted as an attempt to reduce the status of non-dualistic scriptures to that of mere Dakṣiṇatantras; it would in other words deny their claim to supremacy.

It is important to note that none of these systems is neutral enough to be a candidate for a scientific description of Tantric literature. Since the structure of the canon is one of the vital parts of the self-description of a school, we cannot deal with any of these classificatory systems without assuming a hidden agenda.

The system described by FILLIOZAT as given in the *Ajitāgama*, in which the Siddhāntatantras are divided among all five faces, is anomalous and can

94 See GOODALL (1995), Appendix I, p. 228, for lists of Siddhāntatantras compiled from early sources.

95 But it should be noted that the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* calls the sixty-four Tantras the *sādāśivaṃ cakram*, but nowhere *bhairavabheda*!

96 See SANDERSON (1986), p. 182 (fn. 64).

97 Pace DVIVEDA: *catuḥṣaṣṭir advayapradhānā bhairavabhedāś ca dakṣiṇavaktraniḥsṛtāḥ*, *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*, p. 55.

be ignored here.[98] The confusion caused by such comparisons stems from the now obsolete assumption that the Tantras transmitted in South-India under the names of the twenty-eight are those very works to which the early exegetes refer.[99] In fact, "of the twenty-eight tantras that are listed as scriptures of the Śaiva Siddhānta very few are demonstrably early works. Most are South Indian redactions or entirely fresh compositions that were unknown to Rāmakaṇṭha."[100] As none of the surviving early Tantras are from the Śivabheda, and only very few references to this part of the canon are known in early literature,[101] we cannot say that the *śiva-* and *rudrabheda* are more real than the *bhairavabheda*.[102]

For the Kashmirian non-dualists of Abhinavagupta's school the scriptural authority on the details of the division of the *pañcasrotas* was the *Śrīkaṇṭhī*. Fortunately this part of the text has been discovered by Prof. SANDERSON[103] in Takṣakavarta's *Nityādisaṃgraha*, a Kashmirian ritual manual. The reader will see in the transcript that is given in the appendix that the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* provides us with a multitude of classifications among which we find the group of sixty-four Tantras. Its main classification of the canon is however not Abhinavagupta's threefold division, but a division into six streams: five plus the lower (see vss. 315–317).[104]

---

98 See the French Introduction to *Rauravāgama*, vol. 1, p. xi.

99 "Among the numerous branches of the śaiva tantric literature, Śaiva-Siddhānta is one of the most accessible to us, as much of its ancient literature has survived to the present day. It is defined as a school of Śaivism based on 28 āgamas or tantras, a series beginning with *Kāmika* and ending with *Vātula*. It is thus differentiated from the other *dakṣiṇa* school of Śaivism associated mostly with Kaśmīr which is told to be based on a series of 64 *āgamas*. The high number of texts in the latter series may be theoretical, and is not confirmed by the available documentation. But we can say that the number of 28 of the Siddhāntins is a reality, as they are represented in manuscripts found mostly in South India."*Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, introduction, p. xxiv. Similarly DYCZKOWSKI (1988), p. 153.

100 GOODALL (1995), p. xiv–xv, and passim for the arguments on the antiquity of some of the Tantras. These are the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* (only the vidyāpāda of the Pondicherry edition), *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, *Kiraṇa* (ed. Goodall), *Niḥśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, *Pārameśvara* (Cambridge Ms. Add. 1049, identified by SANDERSON as the *Pauṣkara*), the *Mṛgendra*, *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Sārdhatriśatikālottara* and the *Sarvajñānottara*. A recent discovery by GOODALL is the *Parākhya*. See BRUNNER (1992), p. 31–36, for arguments that the *Acintya*, *Suprabheda*, *Kāraṇa* and *Kāmika* that are preserved in South-Indian mss. are later.

101 GOODALL (1995), p. xvi.

102 See BRUNNER (1992), p. 31–36, where some of the points made in BRUNNER (1985) are revised.

103 SANDERSON (1986), p. 182 (fn. 65).

104 Pace DYCZKOWSKI (1988), p. 43.

1.7 Tantrālokaviveka 1.18

In his TĀ Abhinavagupta summarizes the threefold division only in one verse in the beginning of the work and fortunately the commentator Jayaratha feels prompted to provide the reader with the details of this doctrine. Since the description of this division in the *Vārttika* would be virtually uninterpretable without this passage, it is translated here in full:[105]

> *The essence of the teaching of the pervading Lord, which is divided into ten, eighteen and sixty-four, is the Trikaśāstra, and the essence of that is the Mālinīmata.* [=TĀ 1.18]
>
> [Viveka:] In our system, all scripture unfolds (*ujjṛmbh*) as supreme knowledge on the highest level of speech, which consists of a knowledge that is essentially the supreme form of articulation, as it is replete with all things.[106]
>
> On the visionary plane [of language] the articulation "I" (*ahaṃ*) appears inwardly; this articulation is unique, because in its nature denoter and denoted are yet undivided. Therefore the object of expression articulated by the perceiver appears here only inside ("veiled by") the nature of *ahaṃ*.[107]
>
> Thereafter, on the intermediate plane [of language], the same scripture shines only inwardly as [differentiated into] the natures of denoter and denoted, because of the appearance of a multitude of subjects and objects of experience. For on this level, Śiva himself brings down the whole Śāstra in five streams [which he effects] through resting on the state of Lord Sadāśiva by making manifest his five powers 'consciousness', 'bliss', 'volition', 'cognition' and 'action' [as Sadāśiva's body], and by combining his five faces. [The resulting group of scriptures] is manifold through divisions and subdivisions, because it is characterized by duality, duality-cum-non-duality and non-duality.[108]
>
> [How] it becomes manifest on the mundane level [of language] can be explained as follows: at first three scriptures appear when each of [the faces]

---

105 The passage has been analysed in GNOLI (1972), p. 70, fn. 17.

106 The evolution of the Śaiva canon is here explained as a process of articulation of knowledge. Its stages are the four phases of speech, namely "supreme" (*parā vāk*), "visionary", "intermediate" and "physical".

107 In the visionary plane the letters of the Sanskrit alphabet appear in an undifferentiated form as *a-ha-ṃ*. This "explanation" of the first person pronoun suggests that the subject of perception is the main reality, in which the objects are merged.

108 The interesting point here is that the five or six streams (*srotas*) are still above normal language and that the categories to which actual texts can be attributed are the three divisions.

Īśāna (Ī), Tatpuruṣa (T) and Sadyojāta (S) are about to appear, and [another three] when they have appeared (No. 1–6). There are therefore six scriptures from single faces. There is one scripture when all three appear together (No. 7). When these three form groups of two, i.e. Īśa-Tatpuruṣa, Īśa-Sadyojāta and Sadyojāta-Tatpuruṣa, three scriptures appear (No. 8–10). These are the ten scriptures of Śiva in which duality is predominant. This has been taught [in the following verse]:

[quotation of MVV *374–375ab*]

The eighteen divisions of Rudra appear through blending these [three faces] with Vāmadeva (V) and Aghora (A). That means that, in this [division], two scriptures are formed through Vāmadeva (No. 1) and Aghora (No. 2) alone. The reason [for taking only these two] is that although there are five faces, three faces, namely Īśa, [Tatpuruṣa] and [Sadyojāta] have been taught [to form] the division of Śiva, and a repetition of things taught before is not appropriate. [...][109] As Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta lack own nature, they do not combine and four [theoretically possible] combinations[110] are absent. So only three texts formed of two faces remain: Īśāna and Vāmadeva (No. 3), Īśāna and Aghora (No. 4), and Aghora and Vāmadeva (No. 5); these are the three texts formed by two faces.
And by combining the five faces, namely Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa, Sadyojāta, Vāmadeva and Aghora into groups of three, first by combining Īśāna with [two] other faces one by one, six combinations result. Adding three for Tatpuruṣa, and one for the combination of Sadyojāta with the remaining faces, we arrive at ten; but the first combination of three, i.e. Īśa, Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta, has been mentioned in the division of Śiva, and the last combination of three, consisting of Īśa, Vāma and Aghora will be used for a different purpose. Thus eight combinations of three remain and the result is eight scriptures from three faces [ĪTV (6), ĪTA (7), ĪSV (8), ĪSA (9), TSV (10), TSA (11), TVA (12), SVA (13)].
[...] There are also five ways to combine the five faces in groups of four, but according to the rule mentioned above that there is no connection of Tatpuruṣa, Sadyojāta, Vāmadeva and Aghora, only four combinations of four remain [ĪTSV (14), ĪTSA (15), ĪTVA (16), ĪSVA (17)]. By combining all faces there is one fivefold combination (No. 18). These are the eighteen

109 The next sentence seems corrupt.

110 Sadyojāta/Vāmadeva, Sadyojāta/Aghora, Tatpuruṣa/Vāmadeva, Tatpuruṣa/Aghora.

scriptures of Rudra which have duality and unity as their main [doctrine]. This has been taught [as follows]:

> *When the three faces [mentioned earlier] combine with the left and right face, then seven divisions of two, and eight divisions of three are the result. There are four combinations of four and one combination of [all] five.*
> *But of these twenty combinations [four have to be omitted] as Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta do not combine with Vāmadeva and Aghora, because the eastern and western face can never acquire knowledge independently; thus sixteen remain.*
> *But there is the nature of Vāmadeva and, even higher, that of Bhairava. Therefore [with these two added] there is an eighteenfold division of Rudra which has been taught by Śiva in the Śāstras.*[111]

And the same has been stated in the holy *Śrīkaṇṭhī* in detail after giving the names of the [scriptures] (*abhidhānapūrvam*):[112]

> [quotation of *Śrīkaṇṭhī* 108–112]

In this context the same [author, i.e. Abhinavagupta] teaches:

> *It has been taught that the division called Śiva [receives its name from the fact that] it is taught by Śivas [i.e. different manifestations of Śiva], the division called Rudra [as it is] taught by Rudras.*[113]

Eight multiplied with the [number of] *vasus*, i.e. eight, are sixty-four, the division of Bhairava. To explain: in the southern face, which is free from duality and which [is of fourfold nature:] essence (*svarūpa*), Śiva, Śakti, and the *yoginīvaktra* which is called "their union",[114] there is [in each of them]

---

111 Of this quotation only the first line is identical with verse *376ab* of the *Vārttika*. GNOLI (GNOLI (1972), p. 70, fn. 17) assumes that this is taken from the lost *Pūrvapañjikā*.

112 This probably refers to the practice of the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* to list the names of the texts and then to add subdivision and more detailed descriptions.

113 This is a quotation of *Vārttika 408d–409ab*.

114 The reading accepted in the $K_{ed.}$ *advayasvabhāve svarupe*, is redundant. Manuscript *kha* is more convincing, since it provides us with four items. It is rather odd to find the *yoginīvaktra* here, as it is usually a name for the lower face. But here Jayaratha faces a dilemma. On the one hand he wants to provide the reader with the names of the Tantras by quoting the *Śrīkaṇṭhī*, but he also wishes to interpret the passage in line with the *Vārttika*. Now these two sources differ in one important point: the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* attaches much weight to the lower

a fourfold form, i.e. being about to arise, arisen, about to disappear and disappeared. When this sixteenfold form [of Aghora] suddenly merges with all the other four faces, then their mutual combination results in the sixty-four divisions of Bhairava, in which non-duality is the main [doctrine]. This is taught [elsewhere]:

[quotation of MVV *383–384* and *388cd–390*]

The same has been stated in the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* in detail after giving the names of the [scriptures]:

[quotation of *Śrīkaṇṭhī* 270ff.]

"Divided" (*bhinnam*)[115] through these [divisions] implies that it is manifold through its divisions and subdivisions. This variety through other divisions and subdivisions has been taught in the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* with regard to the Tatpuruṣa-face [quotation of 151cd], also [with regard to the southern face] [quotation of 220ab] and the [Vāmadeva-face] [the quotation that follows cannot be traced in the *Śrīkaṇṭhī*, but cf. vs. 269.]; this (*tad*) [variety] consists [also] of subdivisions that are caused by the fact that each of these faces is again fivefold. Therefore (?*iti*) I have summarized it from the same source (*tata eva*), but not dealt with it separately here. The same has been stated [by Abhinavagupta]:

[quotation of *378*]

And therefore it is an established doctrine that this Śāstra was created in three parts, which are called Śiva, Rudra and Bhairava and teach [respectively] duality, duality-cum-non-duality and non-duality. This has been taught [by the same author] :

[quotation of *391–392ab*]

And thus the Lord[116] immerses this Śāstra, consisting also of duality etc., in the nectar of supreme non-duality by embracing the sixth group of three, i.e.

face, the *Vārttika* does not mention it, and – more importantly – has no place in its system for it, since the sixth stream is already reserved for the *ūrdhvordhva*. I think that Jayaratha's way out of this impasse is to subsume the *yoginīvaktra* under the Aghora-face.

115 This refers to TĀ 1.18.

116 As this is intended as a summary of *395–396*, I would propose to read *parameśvaraḥ* here.

> Īśāna, Vāma, Dakṣiṇa, as places of rest for the three powers Parā, [Parāparā] and [Aparā][117] according to the saying:
> "Like the smell in the flower, the oil in the sesame seed, the living soul in the body and the taste in water, the Kula [doctrine] resides inside all Śāstras as their essence."[118]
> Otherwise [without being bathed in supreme non-duality] the Śāstra will not become a means for attaining the supreme state. This has been taught [by Abhinavagupta]:
>
> [quotation of *395cd–396* and *398*]
>
> [Opponent:] What is a valid source for this, as no such doctrine is found. [Answer:][119] In this matter [Abhinavagupta] has taught that the lineage of teachers is the source for this:
>
> [quotation of MVV 393cd–394ab]
>
> [Opponent:] You are turning the objection, namely that this [doctrine] has sprung merely from human intellect [i.e. has no scriptural source], into its own answer. This is really an unprecedented feat of learning; therefore some scriptural source has to agree with it in order to answer this. [We answer:] No! For Āgama itself is taught to be undisputed knowledge. [...][120]

We need not quote the remainder of Jayaratha's commentary on this verse. For him the fact that great Gurus agree on this point is sufficient proof for the authenticity of this doctrine. The long discussion of objections that follows, and the rather strong tone of it,[121] might indicate that the arguments for this reinterpretation of the *pañcasrotas*, an interpretation whose hardly veiled purpose it is to contest the supremacy of the Siddhānta, were indeed without a clear scriptural support.

Jayaratha then concludes his commentary on TĀV 1.18 with a discussion of the gradation of Śaiva scripture.[122]

---

117 The reading *parādi-* is perhaps wrong for *aparādi-*. See commentary on *395–397*.

118 =TĀ 35.34

119 The second *nanu* has to be deleted.

120 I am grateful to Harunaga Isaacson for the interpretation of this paragraph.

121 See for instance: *yadi cārvāgdṛśāṃ bhavādṛśām evaṃvidhā śrutiḥ karṇagocaraṃ na gatā* [...], p. 47.

122 This is analysed in SANDERSON (1997).

Chapter 2
The *Mālinīślokavārttika*

The *Mālinī[vijayottara]tantra* is Abhinavagupta's main source for the Trika and four of his works deal with it: the lost *Pūrvapañjikā*,[1] the *Mālinīvārttika*, the *Tantrāloka* and the *Tantrasāra*. For Abhinavagupta this Tantra was the "supreme essence" of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, which in turn is the main scripture of the Vidyāpīṭha division.[2] The name of the Tantra reflects its claim that it is a shorter version[3] of an earlier *Mālinī*, which in turn is a shorter version of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*.[4] The text is also called *Mālinī* or *Śrīpūrva*.[5]

If we look at Abhinavagupta's works that deal with this Tantra, we have one Paddhati of the Trika system as taught in the *Mālinī* (*Tantrāloka*), its summary (*Tantrasāra*), one work that was perhaps an extensive prose commentary (*Pūrvapañjikā*), and a *Vārttika*.

According to the popular definition we would expect a *vārttika* to examine what is taught, what is not taught or taught imperfectly in a work.[6] If we look at the most famous *Vārttika*s on the traditional Indian syllabus, those by Kātyāyana and Kumārila, this definition seems justified; both include a critique or at least clarification of their sources, namely the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Śabarabhāṣya*. This cannot be applied to an Āgama, if one holds the view that it is in some sense *the* source of knowledge. The only method a

---

1 The name of this work, for which see GNOLI (1972), p. 887, is given as *Pūrvapañcikā*, which is an orthographic variant common in Kashmirian manuscripts (it is also used in an autograph of the *Laghupañcikā* on the *Haravijaya* by the famous scribe Ratnakaṇṭha, Bodleian Library, Ms. Stein Or. c. 11). The work is referred to and quoted in *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, p. 23f and p. 57. In TĀV 23.75 two verses are quoted and it is referred to as a *vivaraṇa*. The verses could be summary verses and the commentary itself a prose commentary like the PTV.

2 See TĀ 37.24cd–25ab.

3 See TĀ 36 for the different stages in the descent of this scripture.

4 See MVT 1.8–13.

5 See GNOLI (1972), p. 888, s.v. *Pūrva*. Cf. *Śrīkaṇṭhī* 228c.

6 *uktānuktaduruktacintā vārttikam*, *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* (adhyāya 2, p. 5).

commentator can adopt is to make explicit a hidden sense, which one could justify by the abbreviated form in which the Āgama has come down or by the secrecy of the doctrine. Abhinavagupta commits himself to a very strict position by saying that everything is told in the *Mālinītantra* explicitly or implicitly (*liṅgataḥ*).[7] And he states in another passage that there cannot be any question of non-literal meaning (*arthavāda*) as regards the word of Śiva.[8] This, however, is a theological program: in concrete exegesis Abhinavagupta's system is well aware of non-ultimate statements in a valid scriptural text. The usual definition of a *vārttika* could therefore be justified: it would be a commentary that could find its way through conflicting statements about Śaiva practice by rejecting some, namely provisional, rules like the injunction to perform a specific worship, and by providing the arguments that can establish a hierarchy of these conflicting injunctions. I think this approach can be discerned in the discussion of *Mālinī* 18.74–81 in the fourth chapter of the *Tantrāloka* (212–278)[9] and the same principle applies to our text.

The text of the *Vārttika* falls into two disparate chapters, the first with 1135, the second with 335 verses which are mostly *anuṣṭubh* with only short passages or single verses in longer metres. There are not many quotations and astonishingly few from the MVT. The first question is therefore, on which parts or concepts of the Tantra the author is actually commenting upon.

One view to be found in the secondary literature is that of the *Vārttika* being a commentary only on the first verse of the MVT. It is based on the concluding verse by the author himself, in which he states that he has commented only on the first verse, and this impression is reinforced by the fact that the first verse of the Tantra is quoted in full in the beginning of the commentary. This has created some funny conceptions, as for instance in PANDEY's pioneering volume on Abhinavagupta, where he says of the *Pūrvapañjikā*:

> "From its name, Pañcikā, which means a detailed exposition, and from the frequent references to it in most of Abhinava's writings it seems to have been a very big work. An idea of its size can be formed from the available part of the Mālinī Vijaya Vārtika which is an exposition of only the first verse of the Mālinī Vijaya Tantra, as he himself says in its concluding line:

7 TĀ 1.17.

8 TĀ 4.232: *nārthavādādiśaṅkā ca vākye māheśvare bhavet.* This is in contrast to Saiddhāntika exegesis: Sadyojyotis talks of *anuvādasūtras* and *arthavādasūtras* as being part of a Tantra. See Sadyojyotis on *Svayambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 1, p. 4.

9 The TĀ is also called *Vārttika* by Abhinavagupta himself in a cross-reference.

> pravarapuranāmadheye pure pūrve kāśmīriko 'bhinavaguptaḥ
> Mālinyādimavākye vārtikam etad racayati sma.
> What must have been the size of the detailed exposition of the whole of the above Tantra, it is not difficult to imagine. This work, however, seems to be irrecoverably lost. Its loss to śaiva philosophical literature is irreperable."[10]

Although it does not become clear whether it is PANDEY's view that the *Vārttika* as it is is incomplete, it seems that he takes the statement about the *Vārttika* being a commentary on the first verse only as literally true.

We find another early statement on the *Vārttika* by MADHUSŪDAN KAUL, who writes in his introduction to the MVT: "The first verse of the Tantram he took up in his Mālinīvijayavārttika and explained it so thoroughly that connotations of several terms are made clearly intelligible. The points, that could not find room in the Vārttika for want of space and owing to its limited scope as Vārttika, he discussed in the Tantrāloka."[11]

There is probably no word limit for a *vārttika* and the argument of space is therefore not to be taken seriously, but the impression that the connotations of the first verse of the Tantra are explained at great length is certainly correct. This first verse, which forms verse *14* of the *Vārttika* runs as follows:

> The rays of the moon of knowledge which issue from the face of Parameśa [i.e. Śiva] and are capable of destroying [everything] opposed to universal bliss surpass all. (14)

The light from the half-moon on Śiva's head, which is identified with knowledge, is reflected in his face and sends out cooling rays. Although not easily understood from a north-European perspective, one standard comparison for *saṃsāra* is "heat", and the knowledge that destroys ignorance that is the cause for *saṃsāra*, is consequently associated with the coolness that is embodied in the moon.[12] But for Abhinavagupta this is not just an introductory poetic image in a *maṅgala*-verse. It implies the descent of this liberating knowledge from its source above Śiva's head down to his five heads and, through this process of reflection, its differentiation into scriptural revelation. The explanation of this idea forms the first section of the *Vārttika* which is the topic of the present thesis.

---

10 PANDEY (1963), p. 37.
11 MVT, Introduction, p. xvi.
12 One must add that besides this pan-Indian image Kashmirian winters have also lead to the description of a *saṃsāraśiśira* (*Tantrasāra*, p. 135.)

A summary of the whole *Vārttika* is beyond the present work, but we shall now briefly discuss its structure. If we look at the concluding verses of the first chapter, we find an explicit statement to the effect that the first Kāṇḍa is a commentary on chapters 1–17 of the *Mālinītantra*. Obviously the reader has to be made aware of this fact, because there are hardly any indications for it in the text itself. We see on the other hand from the choice of words that, at the end of the first Kāṇḍa, Abhinava still has the first verse of the Tantra in mind. The second Kāṇḍa of the *Vārttika*, which has only 335 verses, starts unambiguously with a reference to the 18th chapter of the Tantra, thereby confirming that it deals with the remaining chapters of the root text. Again, the end of the second Kāṇḍa is reminiscent of the first verse of the *Mālinī* and the last verse of the *Vārttika* contains the statement quoted above that the author has only commented on the first statement of the Tantra.

From the fact that the first part, at least in some sense, deals with chapters 1–17 of the Tantra and the second part with the remaining chapters, we can conclude that the text of the *Vārttika* as we have it is a self-contained work, and this is recognized by the editor Madhusūdan Kaul in his introduction to the edition of the text.[13] Much less obvious is the reason for the division into two unequal chapters. The MVT is not divided into pādas but into 23 adhikāras; the 18th chapter is in a section on Yoga, which started with chapter 12, but its importance for Abhinavagupta lies in the fact that it is mainly there that he can find passage to sustain his monistic interpetation of this basically dualistic text and to postulate a hierarchy of levels inside monistic Śaivism.[14]

Another important question is the relationship between the *Mālinīśloka-vārttika* and the *Tantrāloka*. I cannot quote any conclusive figures, but it seems that there are many parallels and quite a few almost identical verses between the second Kāṇḍa and parts of the TĀ, but almost none of the first section of the first Kāṇḍa, i.e. vss. 1–399. Although there is the possibility that the *Pūrvapañjikā* has dealt with the same issues, this section of the *Vārttika* was unique enough to be referred to by Abhinavagupta himself in the last chapter of the *Tantrāloka* for its description of the descent of the five streams of the Śaiva revelation:

---

13 "The whole work has been thrown into two parts or Kāndas, the first part being devoted to the subject matter dealt with in the first seventeen chapters in the above Tantra and the latter throwing light on the remaining portion." First page of the Introduction to the Kashmirian Edition of the *Vārttika*.

14 See SANDERSON (1992) for dualism in the *Mālinī*, and SANDERSON (1997) for the interpretation of the eighteenth chapter.

"The nature of the [five] streams, starting from the immovable highest state, has been taught by us in the *Mālinīślokavārttika* in detail and those eager to know should be able to understand it from there. But we do not sanction useless repetition.[15]

15 *mayaitat srotasāṃ rūpam anuttarapadād dhruvāt | ārabhya vistareṇoktaṃ mālinīśloka-vārttike || jijñāsus tata evedam avadhārayituṃ kṣamaḥ | vayaṃ tūktānuvacanam aphalaṃ nādriyāmahe* ||37.31||

Chapter 3
The Text of the *Mālinīślokavārttika*

3.1 The Names of the Text

The Tantra which is the basis for Abhinavagupta's commentary is called *Mālinīvijayottara* or abbreviated *Mālinīvijaya* and our text is therefore called *Mālinīvijayavārttika* (MVV), *Mālinīvārttika*, or *Mālinīślokavārttika*, the last one being used by Abhinavagupta himself to refer to the text in the TĀ. There have been a few misconceptions about the name of the text and some remarks in this matter are necessary for clarification.

In his article on the *Works of Abhinavagupta* RAGHAVAN notes: "Further, on p. 107 of his Tantrasāra, (Kas. Texts, XVIII), Abhinavagupta makes mention of his Tantrāloka and adds to it a perplexing reference to a śloka Vārttika. Are we to understand a work of Abhinavagupta here, and if so, whether one of his known works or a new one?"[1] The text under discussion runs as follows: *anvartham cātra darśitaṃ tantrāloke ślokavārttike ca*. Commenting on the same passage in his *Krama Tantricism* RASTOGI says: "Besides, Abhinava refers to one ślokavārttika in the Tantrasāra. It is uncertain whether this is identical with the famous Mīmāṃsā text of the same name by Kumārilā. But the way Abhinava refers to it and the context in which it finds a place, makes it quite probable that Abhinava might have attempted a work under this name. Or else it might be another name of the Mālinīvijayavārttika."[2] In his introduction to the *Tantrāloka* RASTOGI modified his view: he quotes references to the *Tantrāloka* under the name *vārttika* and *ṣaḍardhaślokavārttika*, which are given by Abhinavagupta in the *Īśvaraptayabhijñāvimarśinī*.[3] As the TĀ is quoted there, one must conclude that the TĀ has indeed been called *ślokavārttika*. But from this and the "non-discovery of any text by the name of

1 RAGHAVAN (1980), p. 22.

2 RASTOGI (1979), p. 159.

3 III, 259: *mayā ca vārtike etat vyākhyātam*; III, 106f: *anvārthaṃ cātra darśitaṃ tantrāloke ślokavārttike ca*; I, 33: *yathoktaṃ mayaiva śrīṣaḍardhaślokavārttike tantrāloke*. See RASTOGI (1987), p. 2f.

the *Ślokavārtika* (pertaining to K.[ashmir] S.[aivism?])" he concludes that the cross-reference in the *Tantrasāra* can only mean "in the Tantrāloka, which is a Ślokavārttika".

The confusion about the term *ślokavārttika* arises, because it denotes above all a type of commentary; as the one by Kumārila was perhaps the most well-known, it could be referred to as *the Ślokavārttika*, but technically both the TĀ and MVV are *ślokavārttikas* and the fact that the name of the commentary is used a few times for referring to the TĀ does not exclude the possibility that it may be used for the MVV in another context. If, moreover, the names *Tantrāloka* and *Ślokavārttika* are combined with "and", as in the *Tantrasāra* passage under discussion, there is no need for RASTOGI's laborious interpretation. We find the correct interpretation already in GNOLI's translation of the *Tantrasāra*: "nel *Tantrāloka* e nel commento in versi al *Mālinīvijaya*."[4]

3.2 Editions and Manuscripts

The MVV appeared in print for the first time in 1921 in the *Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies* (KSTS)[5] and has, to my knowledge, never been reedited. We can ignore a version of the text that appeared in 1985 as a small booklet ed. by Krishnānanda Sāgar, since it contains the text of the editio princeps, but the misprints produced by the new typesetting and the omission of the critical apparatus makes it virtually useless for this study.[6]

It is not easy to estimate the value of the first edition. Despite its shortcomings we must be very grateful for it, as for the whole KSTS, without which this segment of Tantric philosophy would still be studied from the *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*. From this perspective to lament the lack of attention to detail would indeed be unfair, because the editors who wished to print virtually all the main texts of the known Śaiva philosophy of Kashmir could not indulge in long discussions. However, it must be noted that the editors sometimes decided on a text that hardly makes sense or is not even metrically correct.

The KSTS edition is based on two manuscripts which are described in the introduction as follows:

---

4 GNOLI (1979), p. 190.

5 Srī Mālinivijaya Vārttikam of Abhinava Gupta. Edited with notes by Pandit Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. KSTS XXXI. Srinagar 1921.

6 śrīmadabhinavaguptācāryaviracitaṃ mālinīvijayavārttikam. Published by Krishnand Sagar. Varanasi 1985; English Title "Shri Madabhinavaguptacharya of Malinivijayavartikam" [sic].

"(a). This Ms. belongs to the manuscript section of the SRI PRATAP SINGH PUBLIC LIBRARY. This is one of the oldest Mss. in the stock. Its leaves are torn out here and there and number 250. The character in which the Ms. is written is old Sâradâ [.] Kashmiri paper of old type, one-half Foolscap in size, has been used in the Ms. On an average, a page contains 13 lines with sixteen letters in each. The first 11 leaves of the Ms. seem to have been restored recently. The Ms. is complete with a few slips of pen. It does not bear any date. [...]
(b). This Ms. is on new Kashmiri paper. There is no mention of the date when the copy of the Ms. was made. It is complete and is written out in Sáradá character with a few mistakes here and there. It belongs to late PANDIT RAMADEVA BHATTARAKA son of PANDIT SUKADEVA of Srinagar, Kashmir, who lived the life of a Saiva teacher to the last day of his life."

The editors record variants in the footnotes and make a few emendations, but unfortunately fail to specify the manuscript from which the variant was taken. Judging from the edition of the *Mālinīvijayottaratantra*, a comparable volume in the same series which has a substantial list of corrections, the lack of a "*śuddhipātram*" in the edition of the *Vārttika* is also slightly discomforting. Under these circumstances it would no doubt be desirable to find and recollate the manuscripts used by the editors, but the current political situation in Kashmir is not conducive to search tours, so no attempt has been made to retrieve the Śāradā sources. As it can be made plausible that the whole recension is contaminated, it seemed unnecessary to risk one's life for establishing this beyond doubt.

After an initially fruitless search in manuscript catalogues, Dominic GOODALL drew my attention to the new catalogue of the Śrī Ranbir Library, Jammu, which lists two Devanāgarī manuscripts of the text. With the kind help of B.P. Sharma, Jammu, I was fortunate in obtaining Xerox copies of both mss. After a first comparison with the KSTS edition, my enthusiasm was dampened, because it was found that both manuscripts more or less share the omissions of the edition. This means that all sources that are available at present derive from an archetype that was copied under circumstances where a second copy that still had a complete text could not be obtained. Bearing in mind the history of the Jammu collection, namely the fact that many of its manuscripts are Devanāgarī copies taken from Śāradā archetypes in the late nineteenth century, one might expect these two mss. to be no more than transcripts of the two mss. used for the *editio princeps* and thus only of limited help for the constitution of the text. Fortunately this is not the case. The manuscripts certainly derive

from Śāradā archetypes, but not only is one ms. dated comparatively early (AD. 1789), both often retain the correct reading against the Śāradā sources.

But even with these additional sources a meaningful text could often only be established through conjecture; out of the more than hundred instances in which the present edition differs from the KSTS edition, about half are conjectures. There are cases where one would want to argue that the conjectural reading was with a high probability the reading of the archetype, in other cases the suggested readings are diagnostic, that means they merely allow us to make sense of an otherwise meaningless text or help to restore the metre.

Prof. SANDERSON drew my attention to a further manuscript (G) in which only a few verses are quoted.

3.2.1 Critical Apparatus

In the apparatus of the present edition all variant readings[7] of the manuscripts, with the exception of the purely orthographical variants that are mentioned below, have been listed according to the following conventions: a lemma does not indicate the beginning, but the full passage that is replaced in a particular manuscript with a different reading; it is not reported, if this variant is unmetrical. For instance: 352b svatantram: *svatantratvaṃ* J_2, means that in pāda b of verse 352 the reading of J_2 is unmetrical, not that one more syllable of the critical text has to be replaced to arrive at this variant.

As mentioned above, the *editio princeps* indicates the source of the readings from its two sources only as *iti pāṭhaḥ*. These readings are marked summarily as "K" in the present edition. The siglum K_{ed} ("Kashmir Edition"), although describing the critical text of the *editio princeps*, is therefore also ambiguous: in cases where "K" is not mentioned it means "both Śāradā mss."; where "K" is specified it describes only one of them. All cases where the editors have emended a passage, or where I suspect a misprint, are mentioned explicitly.

As the siglum K, owing to its ambiguity, appears only where the two Śāradā mss. disagree, it was not possible to provide the present edition with a fully positive apparatus. It was on the other hand necessary to give a positive apparatus where K's reading was accepted, but was not identical with K_{ed}, that is, in cases like the following:

7 Unlike in classical Greek and Latin there are hardly any published collations of a substantial number of manuscripts in the field of Sanskrit editions: under these circumstances to produce a selective apparatus is inefficient, as it makes improvements without a complete re-collation impossible.

173d pratipatsyate ($J_{1;2}$;K): *pratipadyate* K_{ed}.

Here the readings of $J_{1;2}$ and K constitute the critical text, whereas the *editio princeps* has accepted *pratipadyate* on the basis of the other Śāradā ms. If this reading were to appear as

pratipatsyate: *pratipadyate* K_{ed}.

it would mean that K_{ed} records no variants and our critical text rests on the agreement of the remaining mss., i.e. J_1 and J_2. This practice may not be completely satisfactory, but it seemed to be the least complicated one, and one which reflects the nature of K_{ed} appropriately: for the purpose of collation K_{ed} is not fundamentally different from a – however skillfully – contaminated ms. with variants noted.

The following features of the two Devanāgarī mss. are not given in the apparatus: punctuation, verse numbering, most cases of gemination and degemination, orthographic variation, like the use of *anusvāra* for class nasals and *ss* for *ḥs* (e.g. *purassara*), *ṃm* for *m*,[8] and in some cases idiosyncrasies of the scribes; the use of the ligature *śca* for *cca* for instance has been noted only in the manuscript description. The confusion of the partly overlapping shapes of *na* and *ta* in the devanāgarī mss. has not been recorded except in suspicious cases, because to note, for instance, that the *ta* in *ataḥ* looked slightly more like a *na* would have certainly been an over-interpretation of the scribes intention. A list of abbreviations is to be found on p. 55f.

3.3 Description of the Manuscripts

The manuscripts are described in the new catalogue of the Shri Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute in tabular form:[9]

J_1 623 (20 ka 2) Mālinīślokavārtika, P[aper], D[evanāgarī], 19.3 x 13.8 cms., 286 leaves, 18–19 lines, 15–21 letters, good, fairly old.

---

8 This is just a writing mistake. Because the scribe did not consider the initial vowel of the next word he placed an anusvāra above the last akṣara, and then added the *m*. Cf. Wilhelm RAU: *Vākyapadīyaprameyasaṃgraha*. Ein anonymes Scholion zum zweiten Kāṇḍa des Vākyapadīya [...], München: Wilhelm Fink 1981. (Abh. d. Marburger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Jg. 1978, Nr. 2), S. 92[8].

9 PATKAR (1984), p. 1154. They are not listed in STEIN's older catalogue. The new catalogue, as will become clear from the description, does not give the impression of being reliable.

J_2 622 (1639) Mālinīvārtikam, P[aper], D[evanāgarī], 23.4 x 14.5 cms., 129 leaves, 16 lines, 10–14 letters, good, fairly old.

I have not been able to work from the manuscripts themselves, but from very carefully produced Xerox copies, for which I have to thank B. P. SHARMA and the librarian of the Shri Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute.

3.3.1 J_1

Catalogue number and title: 623 (20 ka 2) Mālinīślokavārttikam.

The tag on what seems to be the outer wrapping has the following text (devanāgarī in italics): "Shri Raghunatha Temple MSS Library, JAMMU. No. *20 ka-2*. Title: *mālinīślokavārttikam*. Author: *abhinavaguptaḥ*. Extent *286 patra*. Age. Subject: *tantra*". The left upper margin has a further number: *6068*.

The description in the catalogue is unfortunately very inadequate. Although the MVV is probably the most exciting text contained in this manuscript, it is in fact a codex which contains a variety of works, written in Devanāgarī as well as in Śāradā. A full description will have to be the subject of an independent study.

The *Mālinīvārttika* is in Devanāgarī. It spans folios 1–62 and is numbered continuously on the left lower margin. No marginal title.

> Beginning (1^r): *oṃ namo vighnahartre oṃ namaḥ śivāya || oṃ vimalakalā* ....
>
> End (62^r): *iti mālinīślokavārtikaṃ śrīmadācāryābhinavaguptaviracitaṃ samāptam || || śubham astu sarvajagatām || ||*

The writing is characterized by an almost fixed width of the stroke. There are corrections as well as marginal variants (*15d, 31b, 86b, 95a, 101a, 186d*) by a second hand (called J_1^2). A scribe with more practice in transcription from Śāradā must have gone through the manuscript and occasionally corrected the confusion of *ma* and *sa* (*65d*), but also added variant readings.

There is occasional help for reading, as for instance "commas" in *23*: *tadecchā tāvatī, jñānaṃ tāvat, kriyā hi sā*.

The ligature for *ṣṇa* is a *ṇa* "closed" by a horizontal stroke. Apparently the writing utensil did not allow a variable width of the stroke, so that *ṣṇa* and *sma* look virtually identical.

3.3.2 J_2

Catalogue number and title: 622 (1639) Mālinīvārtikam.

The tag on the outer wrapping has the following text (devanāgarī in italics): "Shri Raghunatha Temple MSS Library, JAMMU. No. *1638/ka*. Title: *mālinīvārttikam*. Author. Extent *129 patra*. Age: *saṃ 1846*. Subject: *tantra*". The left upper margin has a further number: *6028*.

Devanāgarī. The abbreviation for the title *mā. vā* and the folio number are in the upper left margin. There are no daṇḍas and the verses are numbered only in the first few pages. Dated A.D. 1789.[10]

> Beginning 1^r: *mālinīvārttikam* in the centre of the page, below a stamp of the library. The text starts on 1^v after a few invocations: *śrīgaṇapataye namaḥ ¦ śrīgurave ¦ śivāyoṃnamaḥ śrīdevyai siddhidāyinyai namaḥ oṃ namo vāgdevyai oṃ vimalakalā ....*

> End: *iti mālinīślokavārtikaṃ ¦ śrīmanmahāmāheśvarācāryavaryaśrīmad-abhinavaguptapādaviracitaṃ samāptam iti śivadaṃ bobhavītu sadbhaktānām* || *śubhaṃ bhavatu* || *śrīnagare liptaṃ 1846 caitre*

Paleographical Notes: *ya* and *tha* are sometimes indistinguishable (5d: *pathe=paye*). *śca* and *śśa* are identical.

3.3.3 G

"Mu I 30" kept in *Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*, Göttingen, and described in detail in JANERT AND POTI (1970), No. 803f. This is an undated Śāradā paper manuscript that contains the few verses from the *Vārttika* identified below:

Mu I 30	MVV
15^{r13}–15^{v1}	I.1012cd–1017
$15^{v1\text{-}13}$	II.35–40

Then follows the attribution of the passage: *ity ācāryābhinavaguptaguravo mālinīvārtike* || *tathā tatraiva*, and another quotation from the text:

---

10 The date which is hardly legible on the Xerox copy is added by hand and is confirmed by the description on the outer wrapping of the manuscript.

Mu I 30	MVV
$15^{v15\text{-}21}$	I.206cd–209b
$15^{v21\text{-}24}$	I.258–259
15^{v24}–16^{r3}	I.255cd–257ab
$16^{r4\text{-}7}$	I.271–272

3.4 Textual Criticism

3.4.1 General Principles

Unfortunately there is not much written on textual criticism as applied to Classical Sanskrit, nor is there consensus about the best approach.[11] The discussion of the theoretical problems in other disciplines evinces the wide divergences that exist: the BÉDIER school is extremely sceptical about the validity of editorial judgements, which results in an unwillingness to do anything else than print "the best" manuscript.[12] This rests on the assumption that the understanding of a medieval scribe must be nearer to the text we wish to publish than that of the contemporary editor. It is apparent that this cannot be applied to Sanskrit manuscripts, many of which were written by scribes who could not understand the texts they were copying. Moreover the sceptic's attitude against attempts to edit texts and the deconstructional pessimism it displays is hardly appropriate for a discipline like Indology, where the need for reliable editions is so obvious.

The other main trends define themselves by the degrees of acceptance or rejection of stemmatology. For some the construction of a stemma of all manuscripts of a text is still the very heart of textual criticism and I shall therefore deal with the question briefly and examine its application for editions of Classical Sanskrit.

The idea behind stemmatic analysis is to find a method through which the editor can arrive at the original reading of a text without editorial bias: it was

---

11 In the field of classical learning there is protracted controversy about the methods including a good deal of polemic and *durjananindā*, see HOUSMAN (1972) and WEST (1973), p. 61.

12 KANE (1969) (p. 158) summarizes the practical conclusions of this approach: "The current scepticism about conjecture extended, as it still may do, to the whole editorial process, and one form of the flight from judgement has been 'to condemn any critical treatment of manuscript material beyond a mere reproduction of the extant tradition or of one of its representatives.' 'One should' (I quote a student of Bédier reporting the master's view) 'select a manuscript which is of the poet's own dialect, which is relatively old, which does not have many mechanical defects and one should reproduce this text without attempting correction unless there is a proved slip of the pen …versification should not be corrected.' "

thought that by establishing genealogical relations between manuscripts based on indubitable evidence one could mechanically arrive at the reading of the archetype without the interference of insecure judgements. One has to bear in mind that this method was developed by LACHMANN while editing texts with what seemed a very simple textual history: the archetype was not too remote from the known manuscripts and all the manuscripts that contained insertions or could be proved to be contaminated were excluded from consideration.[13] According to PASQUALI, LACHMANN, unlike his followers, was well aware of the limitations of this method. But it was MAAS' handbook[14] that, with an exceptional clarity, set stemmatics as the standard for editing any text.[15] The criticism of this method, which focussed on its failure to recognise the prevalence of contamination, led to further modifications of the technique.

As foremost criteria for establishing the relationship between manuscripts are reckoned different forms of external evidence, like omissions in a group of manuscripts which can be traced back to a mechanical defect in a sub-archetype.[16] Apart from this special case the more common method is to identify relations by shared error. According to modern critics there remains the fundamental flaw "that the procedure is theoretically absurd. It designates its first step as classification by shared error whereas in fact it is with the very *identification* of error that the process actually begins. If this act is indeed so self-evident as to require no methodological discussion, then so too, it would seem, is the whole process of editing, which is after all concerned with nothing other than the identification of error."[17] One other assumption of the proponents of stemmatic analysis is the absence of contamination: if a scribe conflated the reading of his source with that of another, his product became useless for the editor and early critics like LACHMANN discarded manuscripts that were demonstrably contaminated! There are different re-

---

13 For the critique of this method, see PASQUALI (1929), p. 427ff.

14 MAAS (1950).

15 MAAS is in fact quite cautious: he says that the stemma has to be tripartite and that the whole recension has to be free from contamination for his method to work, but his short remarks give the impression that contaminated recensions are rare. Correction of errors by scribes is for instance reckoned as "untypisch". According to the more realistic handbook by WEST (1973), p. 72, "only a minority of textual traditions are closed".

16 "A spectacular example is found in the manuscripts of Epictetus, where one manuscript has been defaced with a large greasy stain and all the others are lacking just the obliterated passage. But this example is very much an exception, and despite recent advances paleography has not yet managed to provide evidence about the relationship among documents that is unambiguous." PATTERSON (1987), p. 81.

17 PATTERSON (1987), p. 81.

sponses to this fundamental critique of stemmatology, as for instance to declare contamination as non-existent.[18] Another is to make modifications to the method, e.g. by introducing different phases in which the preliminary stemma is tested.[19] Whereas the first option is clearly implausible, proponents of stemmatology now acknowledge that any stemma is but an approximation to the real relationships; to produce an accurate stemma of a transmission is – especially if manuscripts are lost – statistically impossible.[20] This means that for the greater part of Sanskrit texts there is hardly ever a chance to produce anything but such a pragmatic stemma. For establishing those stemmata GRIER, who acknowledges more recent criticism of the method, has suggested that one should "draw a bipartite stemma that demonstrates the most likely relationships suggested by common error according to the usual guidelines, using only readings from our category three, clear scribal errors",[21] because a multipartite stemma would automatically "eliminate a much higher number of readings" and allow the editor "much less scope in exercising their critical judgement to decide between competing readings."[22] In order to explain why a stemma can be useful we have to take into account the criticism referred to above: a mechanical process of arriving at correct readings is meaningless, if we have to identify their counterpart, error, beforehand. Stemmatology can only work if the correct readings we wish to establish are different from those on which we base our stemma, i.e. we have to establish the clear cases in order to solve the unclear ones. If we further assume that contamination cannot be ruled out in a certain manuscript transmission, I suggest that we use the techniques developed for open recensions and try to produce what WEST calls "a serviceable stemmatic relationship", whereby one can attempt to solve those cases in which other criteria fail.

One other problem that has to be dealt with in order to understand the validity of the different approaches is the identification of the causes of error, which forms the more practical aspect of textual criticism.[23] In the case of Sanskrit there is for instance the transliteration from one script into another, which has to be kept in mind as a source of specific "scribal errors". The two Devanāgarī mss. of the *Vārttika*, for example, contain errors which indicate that their archetype was written in Śāradā. Other errors that can be expected

18 DEARING as reported in WEITZMANN (1977), p. 227.
19 PATTERSON (1987), p. 83.
20 KLEINLOGEL as reported in GRIER (1988), p. 266.
21 See GRIER (1988), p. 274.
22 ibid., p. 264.
23 See especially WEST (1973), p. 15–29.

are, for instance, confusion of aspirated and non-aspirated consonants, if – like in Kashmir – regional pronunciation does not differentiate between them. But the production of a copy from another manuscript involves also the category of more conscious processes of alteration. WEST's description for Greek and Latin applies to Sanskrit to a considerable extent,[24] but there are further indications that the phenomenon of contamination should never be underrated: the comparatively short life-span of manuscripts in India and the consequently high rate of copying – in connection with the fact that probably most of the scribes could hardly follow the text they were copying – must have led to very faulty texts that regularly had to be purged of errors.[25] This no doubt was done by scholars, especially in the process of composing commentaries on a text.[26] If we keep in mind that writing materials were at times precious, the copying will have been undertaken only when necessary. The first attack of insects would hardly have prompted the rewriting of a whole codex. There are also special cases like Kashmir, where one can find perfectly plausible texts almost without scribal mistakes. The reason, as noted already by BÜHLER, is that there often Pandits instead of half-literate scribes would copy manuscripts.[27]

---

24 "The fact that errors occur in copying, and that the comparison of different manuscripts brings variant readings to light, is no modern discovery. It was well known in antiquity, as well as in the Middle Ages, and the precaution was sometimes taken of checking a newly-made copy not only against its immediate exemplar but against another manuscript. When a variant was noticed, it might be introduced into the new copy by correction, or it might be noted in the margin or between the lines [...]. When a copy furnished with this kind of primitive critical apparatus served in its turn as an exemplar to another scribe, he might do any of four things. He might preserve both the variant in the text (t) and the marginal variant (v) in their places; he might retain t and omit v; he might adopt v in the place of t, without mention of t; or he might put v in the text and t in the margin. This confluence of readings from more than one exemplar is known as c o n t a m i n a t i o n." WEST (1973), p. 12.

25 Compare modern Sanskrit *śodhayitvā prakāś* etc. for "to edit". See APTE (1983), s.v.

26 Although many Indian commentators mention and discuss variant readings there are hardly any accounts of the methodology. We can imagine that it must have seemed obvious to those who claimed scriptural authority. In the introductory verses of his *Mataṅgapārameśvaravṛtti* Rāmakaṇṭha says that the commentator has to choose from among "differing readings, correct and wrong, which stem not from the original, but from error committed by students [who were copying the texts?]. To point out these errors is unwise." *pāṭhabhedo 'tra sādhur vā tadanyo vā na mūlataḥ | kiṃtv adhyetṛbhramāt tena tatpradarśanam ajñatā ||*. See Dominic GOODALL's forthcoming work on Rāmakaṇṭha's *Kiraṇatantravṛtti* (Introduction) for a translation of the whole passage. But exegetes do use further arguments to defend their choice of variants, for instance, the evidence of old manuscripts (e.g. *Svacchandatantroddyota* 8.12ab: *purāṇapustakeṣu tv avigānenādya eva pāṭho dṛśyate*), and it would be very useful to collect them.

27 BÜHLER (1877).

It might be argued that contamination should at least be ruled out in the case of manuscripts that are not too far in time from the author. But even if we do not take Al-Bīrūnī's caustic remarks that Indian scribes are able to ruin a text in one or two copies as literally true,[28] we must conclude from a recent example that in the case of works with a wide appeal and therefore swift dissemination mere decades can be enough to produce a contaminated text![29]

A special case is the revision of a text by the author himself that was already circulating in manuscripts;[30] every editor must dread the day when he will be forced to accept such an assumption. In the case of Sanskrit a more typical source of error is certainly the practice of memorizing texts.[31] Whereas the distorting influence of quotations in Latin and Greek is supposed to be due to "inaccurate memory",[32] it is more likely in the Indian context that a scribe substituted the reading he had learned by heart for the one in the manuscript, the more so if we recall that Indian culture always had a higher regard for oral than for written knowledge.

The conclusion must be a strong devaluation of stemmatology except in specially proven cases and the application of methods designed for "open recensions". It can nevertheless be very helpful to produce a stemma from evidence that is less vulnerable to contamination, like clear scribal errors, omission etc., in order to have a criterion for selecting a reading if all other methods fail.[33] If we ignore special cases like compilations,[34] our guidelines must be the canons for the edition of open recensions,[35] once contamination is proven. The main rule is that unless criteria of grammatical, metrical or contextual plausibility etc. force us to emend the transmitted reading,[36] a reading without variants is accepted as archetypal; if variants exist, the one that can explain the origination of the others is accepted as primary. The application of the last rule leads to a variety of further considerations: often the more difficult reading is original, as

28 The passage is quoted in SLAJE (1993), p. 4, fn. 3.

29 ROCHER (1985).

30 See WEST (1973) for historical examples.

31 See BÜHLER (1896), p. 4 on *mukhasthā vidyā*.

32 WEST (1973), p. 17

33 As SRINIVASAN has pointed out, "Kontaminationskritik" is unable to select a correct reading from true synonyms.

34 See SRINIVASAN (1980) for a detailed study of the composition of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. There are also attempts to apply the whole apparatus of techniques, developed for the study of the new testament (source criticism, redactional criticism etc.), to compiled works. Compare also ARRAJ (1988), p. 21ff.

35 The best work for this purpose is SRINIVASAN (1967).

36 See KANE (1969) for a discussion of emendation.

scribes tended to substitute the easier variant.[37] The other principles are related, like the avoidance of ambiguity or redundancy by redactors. In cases where no clear decisions[38] are possible, stemmatic considerations can be of help.

3.4.2 The Textual Transmission of the Vārttika

Any analysis of the stemmatic relationship between the surviving manuscripts of the *Vārttika* is marred by the poor design of the *editio princeps*. We cannot even exclude that the editors have silently corrected "simple" scribal mistakes, thereby further obfuscating the relationship of their sources. This and their failure to report the sources of variants invariably degrades the edition to the status of a contaminated manuscript thereby pushing the relationship between the Śāradā mss. out of sight.

The first observation concerns the lacunae: virtually all the omissions in the K_{ed} are to be found also in the two Jammu mss., but there are further omissions in the Jammu manuscripts, quite a few of them identical ones. One insertion is shared by J_{Σ} and K.[39] This means we have to conclude that the text of the *Mālinīślokavārttika* survived at one time in its history only in one manuscript, from which all other copies derive.[40]

Judging from the variant readings it might seem that the patterns of agreement point to a group formed by J_1 and J_2 against the Śāradā mss. But if we look closer into the quality of errors that separate these groups, we find almost no agreement between the Jammu ms. in "clear scribal errors";[41] most of the agreement is in meaningful variants, which may have arisen through contamination. One might argue that we may at least assume that the contamination originated from the archetype of J_{Σ}, but as even the corrector of J_1 had access to variants overlapping with the Śāradā mss. (cf. the marginal note in *15d*), it is more plausible that the *Vārttika* is transmitted in an open recension. The high

37 Generally the more difficult, but not the more unlikely reading ought to be selected (West (1973), p. 51). In my opinion Srinivasan's chapter 1.4.5.1 ("Einige Male läßt sich eine Lesung nicht, oder nicht befriedigend, interpretieren. Eben dadurch aber weist sie sich als primär aus.") takes the point too far to be made into a general principle.

38 Those cases are typically variants that involve synonyms. Here the tendency of assimilation of related terms in the same context can serve as a guideline. (Srinivasan (1967), 1.4.5.11)

39 See critical apparatus on *257c*.

40 There are of course many indications for this, as for instance *391a*, where all mss. transmit a metrically faulty text – here the external transmission has retained a plausible reading.

41 Except *31c* and *59a*. The insertion of what could at least be seen as the completion of a quotation in *257* is perhaps insignificant.

percentage of metrically correct and more or less meaningful variants among readings point to considerable redaction in the course of its transmission.

3.4.3 External Evidence

An important issue is the status of the external transmission of parts of the text in quotations. We have seen that all surviving manuscripts go back to an already incomplete and possibly quite faulty archetype; additional evidence from outside the transmission could therefore be extremely valuable. The observation that, compared to the variants inside the transmission of the *Vārttika*, the external witnesses sometimes preserve an abruptly different state of the text with sometimes even convincing variants might be taken as a proof of this. On the other hand there are several factors that demand caution: the *Vārttika* is quoted only a few times in later works, and – apart from one instance in Śivopādhyāya's commentary on the *Vijñānabhairava* – these quotations are to be found in Jayaratha's commentary on the *Tantrāloka*. Since the source of these quotations is not mentioned, the strong variation could also indicate that Jayaratha, as suggested by GNOLI, sometimes quotes in fact from another, now lost text by Abhinavagupta, the *Pūrvapañjikā*. But even where it is clear that the *Vārttika* itself is quoted, another consideration speaks against using external evidence as equal to the transmitted text. It has been observed that Abhinavagupta's quotations are often not literal, even when he quotes scripture. This is only partly explained by the necessities of the metre; if we take, for instance, the recurring quotation from Kallaṭa's lost *Tattvārthacintāmaṇi*, we can see that even when writing in prose our authors did not feel obliged to quote literally.[42] The reason for this is to be found in the rules for Tantric exegesis (*vyākhyāna*) – expounded by Abhinavagupta himself in the *Tantrāloka* – , which do not demand a word for word explanation, but simply enjoin that the teacher should propound units of meaning (*vastu*) in the Tantra by various exegetical means.[43] This freedom in exegesis can be

42 *tuṭipāte sarvajñatādayaḥ* TĀV, *tuṭipāte sarvajñatvasarvakartṛtvalābhaḥ* PTV, *tuṭipāte 'pi sarvajñasarvakartṛtvalabdhṛtā* MVV *177*.

43 In chapter 28 of the TĀ there is a section in which the *Devyāyāmala*'s injunctions for explaining Āgamas (*vyākhyānavidhi*) are taught: after a preparatory ceremony, which includes the drawing of lotusses on the ground and the worship of the goddess of speech (*vāgīśvarī*), the Guru is to explain the five *saṃbandhas*, to show the consistency of the work, and use different exegetical methods, as for instance "leaping like a frog" (*maṇḍūkaplava*), that is, omitting irrelevant passages, or "looking around like a lion", which could mean 'taking relevant passages from different parts of the text together'. Abhinavagupta then goes on to

observed in the practice of quoting: if necessary, even the words of scripture are altered by Abhinavagupta. We have to expect that Jayaratha does the same and that his quotations from the *Vārttika* are not on a par with the manuscript transmission of the *Vārttika* itself. For this reason external evidence has only been accepted against the manuscripts in few well-founded cases.

3.5 Stylistic Peculiarities

A comprehensive description of Abhinavagupta's style cannot be attempted in this thesis, though a few observations, notably those concerning the constitution of the text, may be made.

Despite being metrical, the text, as it were, does not comply with its form: the pādas and even verses are quite regularly no indication of a self-contained sentence, and even the end of a sentence may occur after the first word of a pāda. Although he never violates the metre, the author demonstrates that he will not be forced by metre into limiting his argument to 32 syllables: there are Anuṣṭubh stanzas with six pādas which have been observed also in other philosophical works.[44] This, among other features, is peculiar to our author's *philosophical* style, especially to his concept of a *ślokavārttika*, for it appears also in his *Tantrāloka*, but not in his Stotras. An oddity in the construction of the verses in the *Tantrāloka*, namely the connection of the āhnikas in a way that the first half of a verse ends one chapter and the second half starts the next, is discernible in the *Vārttika* too – although less obviously in a text without clear divisions.[45]

An enlightening quotation in his *Vimarśinī* on ĪPK 1.5.12 shows that even a more radical breach of the usual rules was considered admissible in philosophical writing by Abhinavagupta. When interpreting pādas b and c (!) of Utpaladeva's *Kārikā* as a compound, he justifies this by saying: "[The rule that] a word must [coincide with] the connecting point of two half verses is a convention in poetry, but not in technical literature."[46] Although far-reaching conclusions

describe other exegetical methods. The Guru, knowing the wording of the Tantra, should explain the meaning [of a statement] (*vastu*, i.e. a unit of sense, a statement: *vācyaṃ vastv iti mūlasūtrādi* | *aparaṃ vastv iti sūtrāntaram* TĀV 28.406) by using the techniques of *tantra, āvartana, bādha, prasaṅga, tarka* and others. (*tantrāvartanabādhaprasaṅgatarkādibhiś ca saṃnyāyaiḥ vastu vaded vākyajño* TĀ 28.402.) See also DYCZKOWSKI (1988), p. 14.

44 See MESQUITA (1988), p. 21.

45 *288cd* and *289ab*, although constituting a syntactical unit, connect two "chapters" of the work.

46 *ardhayuk pādaviśrāntiḥ iti hi kāvye samayaḥ, na śāstre*. ĪPV 1.5.12.

cannot be drawn from this passage, it has prevented me from conjectures to avoid inelegant caesuras.[47]

There is no indication that prose is used in the *Vārttika*. The singular instance of a *tathā* that is outside the verse and introduces a quotation is treated as a scribal insertion, albeit an early one. Usually Abhinavagupta does not hesitate to rephrase quotations in order to insert an *iti*.[48] The line of prose after *126* is also clearly a scribal insertion.

Abhinavagupta does not limit himself to a terse philosophical style in the *Vārttika*. Although this cannot be a hard and fast rule, one will note that a more poetical diction prevails when he describes his own doctrine beyond the constraints of debate, – often indicated by a concatenation of the buzzwords of esoteric exegesis. This use of poetic language might be interpreted in two ways: it either serves to make doctrines that contain erotic symbolism less offensive by connecting them to the language of the *śṛṅgāra-rasa*; or it is intended to provide a connection between aesthetic experience and the Kula concept of enjoyment. Whereas the former is difficult to rule out, the latter is difficult to prove.

Other observations:

> *alam* is used in the *Vārttika* with the instrumental in the well-attested sense of "enough with …" (*68c, 116a, 159a, 239c, 309c, 720d, 760b*), but also quite often without instrumental (*125a 165d, 199b, 347a 388b, 408b, 449d, 483b, 646c, 653b, 758d, 815d, 960b, 1075d*).
> But in two cases, namely vss. *125a* and *347a*, to assume an adverbial sense of the word is awkward. The phrase used there is *tad alaṃ prakṛtaṃ nirūpyate/brūmaḥ*, which I would interpret as an eliptical use of *alam* in the sense of "enough".[49] The same phrase is used, with an insertion of the instrumental, in *159a–160a*.
>
> Abhinavagupta seems to share with his contemporary Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha the idiosyncratic use of *yataḥ* at the end of a clause (*251b, 327b*).[50] There is also one instance of this in Abhinavagupta's prose (ĪPVV, vol.1, p.4–5; quoted in the commentary on *25cd–28ab*).

---

47 See, for instance *253ab, 282ab, 304ab*.

48 MESQUITA has argued that some words that are standing outside the verse, like *tathā, uktaṃ ca* and *iti*, are original in the *Saṃvitsiddhi*, but there they occur more than once, and in this matter every author must be treated individually. See MESQUITA (1988), p. 21.

49 The dictionaries do not record this, and I could find only one instance (*Bhāskarī*, vol. 1: p. 3, line 11) in literature.

50 See GOODALL (1995), p. vii.

rūḍhi, praroha etc. is used in a peculiar sense in this system. It has the connotation of making the resolve, or convincing oneself of a practice and following it, and is therefore not too far from the meaning given by BÖHTLINGK in the pw ("Entscheidung") for one passage in the *Rājataraṅginī*. Cf. *109d, 142c, 191a, 363a, 398c, 788b, 951a, 989d, 1024b*. These are not even all the occurences in the *Vārttika*. It ought to be investigated whether the high frequency is peculiar to Abhinavagupta's style; a preliminary investigation in the TĀ showed the same usage. This particular usage of the word may have been coined by an acclaimed source, cf. the untraced quotation in TĀV 4.34.

api is sometimes used in a syntactically incorrect position (*bhinnakrama*): *9a, 196d*.

tarpaṇā for *tarpaṇam* (metri causa) in *146d*

The two following tables are a brief[51] metrical analysis of the part of the *Vārttika* that is edited here; the first lists all the Vipulās, the second the non-Anuṣṭubh metres. Numbers marked with an asterisk refer to verses where the metre is dependent on conjecture; *391a* which is metrically wrong is not listed.

*na (ga/ga/na) 6c, 24a, 31a, 39c, 47c, 69c, 112c, 113c, 131a, 143a, 150c, 152c, 155a, 170c, 192c, 209c, 229c, 270a, 309c, *323a, 329c, 333c, 394a*

*na (ra/na) 2a, 72c, 141c, 147c, 172a, 210c, 221a, 227c, 272c, 289a, 356a, *357a, 362a, 371c, 399a*

bha 17c, 23c, 33a, 46c, 104c, 168a, 197c, 183c, 232a, 307c, 313c, 385a

ma 47a, 51c, 62a, 63c, 65a, 65c, 76a, 77a, 112a, 133c, 136a, 153c, 158a, 169a, 188c, 198a, 198c, 242c, 254a, 254c, 255c, 257c, 261a, 270c, 273a, 274a, 291a, 293a, 296a, 302c, 304a, 334c, 364a, 368a, 368c, 376c, 387a, 392a, 392c, 398c

*ra 55a, 184a, *237c, *252c, 343a, 353c, 377c, 386* (? metrical fault)

The following longer metres are used:

Āryā	*130*
Indravajrā	*129, 233*

51 This is not the place to go into details of prosodical practice. I have therefore not collected statistical data on those syllables in the Anuṣṭubh that are usually considered to be anceps.

Narḍataka	*1*
Vasantatilakā	*127*
Viyoginī	*125, 126*
Śikhariṇi	*128*
Svāgatā	*397*
Hariṇī	*382*

3.6 Notes on the Translation and the Commentary

Abhinavagupta's *Vārttika* is undoubtedly a difficult text and the challenge in translating it is certainly not to imitate his sometimes obscure style. A translation should reflect the author's intention and not the translator's difficulty with the text, for which he can blame no one but himself. The resulting "simplification" is due to two techniques: firstly, the transformation of the grammatical construction of the original into an idiomatic expression of the target language; secondly, the insertion of syntactical parts which are regularly omitted in Sanskrit, but required in English. The general remedy for the first is to give literal equivalents in the footnotes, for the second it is to use brackets. In those cases where the inserted word was part of the idiomatic expression itself, brackets were not used, because this might create the impression that almost nothing of the sense attributed to a verse in English could be found in the Sanskrit. In general I have not tried to present an irrefutable, but low-profile translation, but an interpretation of this difficult text which, if wrong, may at least serve as a *pūrvapakṣa*. The same reasoning stands behind the high number of conjectures.

The commentary on every unit, i.e. one or more verses, is usually split into two parts: notes on separate points of grammar, vocabulary etc. and a more or less running commentary that focusses on problems of interpretation.

3.7 Abbreviations Used in the Edition

abbreviations

K_{ed}	text of the *editio princeps*
K	variants given in the footnotes of the K_{ed}
J_1	Devanāgarī ms. Jammu 623 (see below)
J_1^2	second hand in J_1
J_2	Devanāgarī ms. Jammu 622

J_{Σ}	J_1 plus J_2
G	Göttingen ms.
kiṃ<cit> J_1^2	"*cit*" inserted in the margin by second hand
[– – –]	lacuna indicated by scribe with three horizontal lines
†	illegible syllable
t̃i	syllable *ti* deleted by scribe

Part 2

Text and Translation

vimalakalāśrayābhinavasṛṣṭimahā jananī
bharitatanuś ca pañcamukhaguptarucir janakaḥ |
tadubhayayāmalasphuritabhāvavisargamayaṃ
hṛdayam anuttarāmṛtakulaṃ mama saṃsphuratāt ||1||
yadīyabodhakiraṇair ullasadbhiḥ samantataḥ |
vikāsihṛdayāmbhojā vayaṃ sa jayatād guruḥ ||2||
sābhimarśaṣaḍardhārthapañcasrotaḥsamujjvalān |
yaḥ prādān mahyam arthaughān daurgatyadalanavratān ||3||
śrīmatsumatisaṃśuddhaḥ sadbhaktajanadakṣiṇaḥ |
śambhunāthaḥ prasanno me bhūyād vākpuṣpatoṣitaḥ ||4||
gurubhyo 'pi garīyāṃsaṃ yuktaṃ śrīcukhalābhidham |
vande yatkṛtasaṃskāraḥ sthito 'smi galitagrahaḥ ||5||
tato gurutaraḥ śrīmān bhūtirājo mahāmatiḥ |
jayatād bhaktajanatāsamuddharaṇasāhasaḥ ||6||
śrīsomānandasaṃbodhaśrīmadutpalaniḥsṛtāḥ |
jayanti saṃvidāmodasaṃdarbhā dikprasarpiṇaḥ ||7||
taddṛṣṭisaṃsṛticchedipratyabhijñopadeśinaḥ |
śrīmallakṣmaṇaguptasya guror vijayate vacaḥ ||8||
apy asaṃkhyanavāsvādacamatkāraikadurmadā |
yenānuttarasaṃbhogatṛptā me matiṣaṭpadī ||9||
tadekamayatām āpya svātmany eva tathā sthitā |
tad asyāḥ pronmiṣanty eva vividhā nādasaṃpadaḥ ||10||

Sources: K_{ed} (KSTS edition), K (one of the two manuscripts reported in the K_{ed}), J_1 (Jammu 623), J_2 (Jammu 622), J_{Σ} (both Jammu mss.), G (Göttingen fragment). 1c sphurita: *sphuritā* J_1. 2a bodha: *baudha* J_1. 3a marśa: *marca* J_{Σ}. 3a ardhārtha: *anvārtha* J_1, *avārtha* J_2. 3d dalana: *dala* J_1. 4a saṃśuddhaḥ (*conj.* SANDERSON): *saṃśuddha* K_{ed} J_2, ⟨*saṃpanna*⟩|– –| J_1. 4b sad: *mad* J_2. 5b yuktaṃ śrī: *janakaṃ* as quoted in TĀV 1.10. 6d sāhasaḥ: *kovidaḥ* J_1. 7c āmoda: *ānanda* J_1. 7d dikpra: *dikṣu* J_{Σ}. 8d vijayate: *vijayatām* J_1. 10d vividhā: *vicitrā* J_1.

The mother is resplendent (*mahas*) with the ever new creation that
rests on the immaculate power,
and the father, whose form is full, has hidden his desire in his five
faces.
May my heart which is the emission of vibrancy from this couple
and [therefore] full of the supreme nectar shine. (1)

May [my] teacher surpass all, who with the rays of his knowledge appearing everywhere has made the lotus of my heart blossom [and] who entrusted me with the currents of doctrines (*arthaughān*) that are dedicated to destroying the distress [of *saṃsāra*]. [These doctrines] are radiating like [jewels] in the five streams [of Śaiva revelation], which have as their aim the 'half of [the] six' [that are formed by the five streams] together with its reflection. [This teacher] Śambhunātha, who was purified by [his teacher,] the glorious Sumati and is favourable towards true devotees, may he be pleased with me and satisfied with this [offering of the] flowers that are my work.[1] (2–4)

I adore [my father], a scholar whose name is Cukhala and who is more venerable than even the teachers. It is through his education (*saṃskāra*), that I have become free from attachment. (5)

May the glorious, high-minded Bhūtirāja, who [being my father's teacher] is even higher than him, surpass all, he whose zeal is directed towards raising the community of devotees [out of *saṃsāra*]. (6)

The [literary] compositions of the bliss of consciousness, which are exuded by the glorious Utpala[deva] because of [his being] awakened by the glorious Somānanda and spread into all directions, surpass all; in this they resemble compositions of fragrance which are exuded by a water-lily (*utpala*) which is beautiful (*śrī-mat*) because of its awakening [=blossoming] which is the joy of the moon of beauty. (7)

The words of the glorious teacher Lakṣmaṇagupta, who teaches his [i.e. Utpaladeva's] system, the [philosophy of] recognition which cuts off *saṃsāra*, excel. (8)

By whom the bee of my mind, though (*api*) intoxicated only by relishing countless new tastes, is [eventually] satisfied with the ultimate pleasure [/bliss that is the ultimate reality] and, attaining unity with it, remains so in itself [/its own self], that a wealth of different sounds [/doctrines] is opening in her. (9–10)

1 Lit.: "speech".

sacchiṣyakarṇamandrābhyām arthito 'haṃ punaḥ punaḥ |
vākyārthaṃ vartaye śrīmanmālinyāṃ yat kvacit kvacit ||11||
aucityenetaratyāgād vācyavācakayor mithaḥ |
vartanāvarta etasmin sādhu śāstraṃ ca vārttikam ||12||
ye 'harniśaṃ prakāśante sarvasya ca na gocare |
numo 'bhinavaguptāṃs tāñ śivacandrāṃśusaṃcayān ||13||
jayanti jagadānandavipakṣakṣapaṇakṣamāḥ |
parameśamukhodbhūtajñānacandramarīcayaḥ ||14||
aniyantritasadbhāvād bhāvābhedaikabhāginaḥ |
yat prāg jātaṃ mahājñānaṃ tadraśmibharavaibhavam ||15||
tataṃ tādṛk svamāyīyaheyopādeyavarjitam |
vitatībhāvanācitraraśmitāmātrabheditam ||16||
abhimarśasvabhāvaṃ tad dhṛdayaṃ parameśituḥ |
tatrāpi śaktyā satataṃ svātmamayyā maheśvaraḥ ||17||
yadā saṃghaṭṭam āsādya samāpattiṃ parāṃ vrajet |
tadāsya paramaṃ vaktraṃ visargaprasarāspadam ||18||
anuttaravikāsodyajjagadānandasundaram |
bhāvivaktrāvibhāgena bījaṃ sarvasya yat sthitam ||19||
hṛtspandadṛkparāsāranirnāmormyādi tan matam |

11a karṇamandrā: *mandrakarṇā* J_1. 11c vartaye (J_{Σ}): *kathaye* K_{ed}. 12b = *Mīmāṃsāślokavārttika*, Saṃbandhākṣepaparihāra 12b. 12c J_1 adds 'commas' for word divisions (e.g. *vartanā,varta*) and a marginal note: *vartanā vartate tasmāt sādhu śāstram*. 13c numo: *namo* J_2. 14 =MVT 1.1. 15b bhāvābhedaika: *bhāvādbhāvābhedaika* J_1. 15d vaibhavam: *bhairavam* K_{ed}. (*bhairavam* added in the margin by second hand in J_1). 16a tataṃ (*conj.* SANDERSON): *tatas* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 16a tādṛk sva: *tādṛkṣa* J_1. 17cd–20 quoted in TĀV 1.1. 17c satataṃ: *sahitaḥ* TĀV 1.1. (further variants in the mss. there.) 17d svātma: *svatma* J_2. 19d yat sthitam: *saṃsthitaṃ* TĀV 1.1. 20a hṛt: *yat* corrected to *hṛt* J_1^3. 20a spandadṛk: *spandodyat* TĀV 1.1 (*spando dṛk* in ms. kha). 20b nirnāmormyādi: *mūrtinirnāma* TĀV 1.1 (ms. kha).

Since (*yat*) I shall – repeatedly entreated by my worthy pupils Karṇa and Mandra – explain the meaning of the doctrinal statements (*vākyārtha*) in the glorious Mālinī[vijayottaratantra], sometimes (*kvacit kvacit*) through giving up, when appropriate, lower [forms of interpretation] (*itara*) in the sphere of both denoter and denoted, [for this reason] this treatise is fit (*sādhu*) for this whirlpool (*āvarta*) of approaches (*vartanam*) and is [therefore] a *vārttika*. (11–12)

We adore the collection of rays of the moon of Śiva, which shine day and night but are not within reach of everyone and [therefore] ever new [at night] and hidden [during the day]. (13)

The rays of the moon of knowledge which issue from the face of Parameśa [i.e. Śiva] and are capable of destroying [everything] opposed to universal bliss surpass all. (14)

The vast knowledge that is produced in the beginning (*prāk*) from the limitless reality (*sadbhāva*) that alone is identical with the world (*bhāva*) and that is the pervading nature (*vaibhava*) of the mass of the moon's (*tad*) rays has spread (*tataṃ*), [still] of the same nature (*tādṛk*), free from things to be accepted or shunned that are created by its own creative power (*māyā*), and diversified merely by its own expanding manifoldness of rays.[2] This [knowledge] whose nature is articulation is the heart of the highest Lord [Śiva]. (15–17ab)

When Maheśvara unites even there with the power that is always part of his self and attains to supreme perfection, then his highest face, which is the abode from which emission flows,[3] which is beautified through its universal bliss rising from the unfolding of the highest reality [, appears]. Since [this face] is established as the seed of the universe without differentiation into further faces (*bhāvi*),[4] it is called heart, vibration, knowledge (*dṛk*), the highest [level of speech], essence, nameless, wave etc. (17cd–20ab)

---

2 Lit.: "by its nature as rays (*raśmitā*) that are manifold through becoming expanded (*vitatībhāvanā*)."

3 Or: "the abode of [primary] emission and [further] expansion".

4 Lit.: "faces which will exist in future", that means in a later stage in creation.

etat paraṃ trikaṃ pūrvaṃ sarvaśaktyavibhāgavat ||20||
atra bhāvasamullāsaśaṅkāsaṃkocavicyuteḥ |
svānandalīnatāmātramātricchākarmadṛktrayam ||21||
tathā ca guravaḥ śaivadṛṣṭāv itthaṃ nyarūpayan |
sa yad āste cidāhlādamātrānubhavatallayaḥ ||22||
tad icchā tāvatī jñānaṃ tāvat tāvat kriyā hi sā |
susūkṣmaśaktitritayasāmarasyena vartate ||23||
cidrūpāhlādaparamas tadābhinno bhaved iti |
nanu cedṛśi viśvātmabhūte saṃkocavarjanāt ||24||
vikalpakalpanāmūlāḥ kathaṃ śāstrādisaṃpadaḥ |
ucyate sarva evāyaṃ bodhaḥ saṃvitprabhāmayaḥ ||25||
prakāśarūpatāyogāc cidāmarśaghanātmakaḥ |
tatrāmarśasvabhāvo 'yaṃ yaḥ prakāśaḥ prakāśate ||26||
sa eva kiṃ na śāstraughaḥ kim anyair yuktiḍambaraiḥ |
paravāgdevatāviddhas tatrāsau kevalaṃ bhavet ||27||
na tu laukikamāyīyavarṇapuñjavicitritaḥ |
uktaṃ śrīpratyabhijñāyām ātmasaṃsthasya bhāsanam ||28||
asty eva na vinā tasmād icchāmarśaḥ pravartate |
svabhāvam avabhāsasya vimarśaṃ vidur anyathā ||29||
prakāśo 'rthoparakto 'pi tulyo ratnādikair iti |

20c paraṃ: unclear insertion in the margin J_1. 20c pūrvaṃ: *sūkṣmam* K TĀV 1.1. 21b vicyuteḥ (*conj.*): *vicyutiḥ* K_{ed} J_1, *vidyutiḥ* J_2. 21d trayam: *triyam* J_2. 22ab śaivadṛṣṭāvi: this phrase at the end of a page is repeated on the following page, again followed by pādas a und b. J_2. 23a icchā: *ecchā* J_Σ. 23b tāvat tāvat: *tāvat* J_1, *tāvatāvat* J_2. 23c susūkṣma: *svasukṣma* J_2. 22cd–24 = *Śivadṛṣṭi* 1.3–4, which reads *tāvaj jñānaṃ* for *jñānaṃ tāvat* and *nirvibhāgaḥ paras tadā* for *tadābhinno bhavet iti*. 24d saṃkoca: *saṃkodha* J_2. 25d bodhaḥ: *bodha* J_Σ. 26b āmarśa: *āmarṣa* J_1. 27a aughaḥ: *aughāḥ* J_1. 27c para: *parā* J_2.

This is the supreme, primordial trinity, in which all powers are yet undivided. In it contraction [resulting from] the fear (*śaṅkā*) through the appearance of objects vanishes and the three [powers] of the subject, i.e. will, action and knowledge, are therefore completely dissolved in their own bliss.[5] (20cd–21)

This has been described by the master [Somānanda] in his [work] "The Vision of Śiva" as follows: "When he [Śiva or the self] remains [in this state of being] dissolved in this experience of merely bliss of consciousness, then [the powers of] volition, cognition and action are coextensive [with this state][6] [and] he lives as the equilibrium of these three very subtle powers. Being immersed in the bliss that is consciousness, he is then undivided." (22–24ab)

[Opponent:] If [Śiva is] thus [undivided] and the self of the world, then how can there be – as [the possibility of] contraction is excluded – the riches of Śāstras etc. which are rooted in the formation of differential thought? (24cd–25ab)

[Answer:] We teach that all knowledge is part of the light of consciousness and nothing but (*ghana*) being aware (*āmarśa*) of consciousness [itself], as it is [logically] connected to the nature of light. Here 'being aware' means the inherent quality of the light to shine [i.e. become manifest].[7] (25cd–26)

Is not this [conscious light that which constitutes] the flood of Śāstras? What is the use of further arguments?[8] In this state (*tatra*) it [the flood of Śāstras] exists only as pervaded by the goddess of the highest [plane] of speech, but not yet differentiated into a mass of sounds which are used in every-day life and are a product of *māyā*. (27–28ab)

It is said in the *Pratyabhijñā* that "[only] what rests in the self appears [outside]. Without it an awareness of will could not arise. The nature of appearance is known as 'becoming aware' [of the objects that appear], otherwise the light, even though coloured by objects, would be like [that of] jewels etc. [which are coloured by objects but not conscious of them]." (28cd–30ab)

---

5 'Therefore' translates the ablative in *-vicyuteḥ*. Lit.: "Because of the vanishing of contraction [...] there are three powers [...]."

6 Lit.: "then that [experience] is his volition, it is his knowledge, and of such [a nature] is his action."

7 Lit.: "The light that shines is of the nature of being aware." The rather free translation tries to express the purpose of the line in the argument, which is to define *āmarśa*.

8 Lit.: "many (*-ḍambara*) other (*anya*) arguments". *ḍambara* could imply also "useless".

kiṃca yaḥ kaścanāmarśaś ciccamatkāragocaraḥ ||30||
hlādatāpādiviṣayas tadāsau bhavati sphuṭaḥ |
tadvimarśāntarālambasamucchalanayogataḥ ||31||
paścāt susphuṭatām eti tathā ca gurur ūcivān |
yathā svasaṃvidā siddhaṃ sukhādi vyavatiṣṭhate ||32||
na hi vyavasthāsamaye vedyate tat svasaṃvidā |
tathāvaśyopagantavyaṃ svasaṃvitsādhanād iti ||33||
evam atrāpi paścād yaj jñānādyullāsavartmani |
sarvābhedamayī bhūmir yāvad āmṛśyatāṃ vrajet ||34||
tāvat taducitodāravimarśāṃśasphuṭatvataḥ |
tādṛk sa eva śāstratvaṃ prāgvisargaḥ prapadyate ||35||
etad eva tu yuktaṃ syāt tathā hy anupadhau pare |
śāstrārthe 'pi samācāraleśaḥ ko 'pi vibhāvyate ||36||
sa nūnaṃ sphuṭatādhāmabhāvijñānādiśaktimān |
uparāgāt tatas tattadvaicitryaparibṛṃhitaḥ ||37||
yathā mukhasya tadvyaktisthāne 'psu mukure maṇau |
khaḍge cañcalasadvṛttasūkṣmadīrghādikā sthitiḥ ||38||
tad itthaṃ parame rūpe prodbhūtā jñānasaṃpadaḥ |
anavacchinnahṛdayabījātmatrayasundarāḥ ||39||
yadā tūcchaladākārasvataraṅgāntarātmakān |
visisṛkṣati bhāvaughān bhairavaḥ śaktibṛṃhitaḥ ||40||
tadā tā eva vijñānasaṃpadas tadupādhijām |
īṣatkriyāsamācārayantraṇāṃ saṃśritā iva ||41||

30a yaḥ kaś canāmarśaś (*conj.*): *yat kiṃca nāmātra* K_{ed}, *yaḥ kaścanānāmaś* J_1, *yaḥ kaścanāmātrāḥ* J_2. 31a tāpādi: *tāmādi* J_2, *nāmādi* K_{ed}. 31b bhavati: *naiva su* corrected to *bhavati* J_1^2. 31c āntarāla: *atarāla* J_{Σ}. 33a samaye: *samayo* J_1. lacuna in J_2 from *samaye* up to *vacmahe* (52d). 33c gantavyaṃ: *gantavyaḥ* K_{ed}. 34d āmṛśyatāṃ: *āmṛṣyatāṃ* J_1. 35c śāstratvaṃ: *śāstratva* K, *śāstraṃ tu* J_1. 35d visargaḥ: *visarga* J_1. 37b śaktimān: *śaktimat* J_1. 37cd tattadvai: *tattatsa vai* J_1. 38b mukure: *makare* J_1. 40b ātmakān: *āntakān* J_1. 40c bhāvaughān: *ṝe<bhā>vaughān* J_1^2. 41b upādhijām: *upādhijān* K J_1.

Furthermore, any awareness, [the nature of which is to be] in the sphere of experience (*camatkāra*) of consciousness and which has for instance joy or affliction as its object, becomes therefore (*tadā*) perceptible as soon as it appears as resting [inwardly] in this awareness; [and it is only] later that it becomes a clearly perceptible [outward object]. And one teacher said [the same] thus: "Joy and other [perceptions] exist [only because] they are established by one's own consciousness; they are not known through one's own consciousness at the time when they are [already] established as existent [i.e. independent of our perception]. Thus one must certainly accept that [their existence] depends on one's own consciousness as the cause."[9] (30cd–33)

The same [applies] here too [i.e. to the emergence of the Śāstra], for (*yad*) to the same extent (*yāvat*) as, in the course of appearance of knowledge etc., the state in which everything is undivided comes into awareness, to that extent this first emission later (*paścāt*) takes on the nature of the Śāstra, as the parts of its superior awareness, which is fit for this [state], become perceptible. (34–35)

This [account of the nature of the Śāstra] alone is correct, for we suppose that even the highest doctrine of the Śāstra, which is without limiting adjuncts (*anupadhau*), comprises a trace of an extraordinary (*ko 'pi*) [religious] practice (*samācāra*). This [highest doctrine, as it has] the potential of cognition and [the other powers] which will become (*bhāvi*) manifest,[10] is through its influence (*uparāgāt tatas*) certainly nourished by a great diversity. (36–37)

A face appears [different depending] on where it appears[11]: unsteady in water, in the correct round form in a mirror, small in a jewel and stretched in the [blade of a] sword etc. In the same way the riches of knowledge that are beautified by three [powers] lying undivided in the heart as seeds have arisen (*prodbhūtāḥ*) in the highest being (*parame [sva]rūpe*). (38–39)

But when Bhairava [like the ocean], brimming with power, desires to emit the floods of things that are [but] other waves of himself, whose forms are [continuously] welling up, then these riches of knowledge seem to take on constraint [due to] a practice which is [only] a slight activity, [a constraint] which is caused by the limitation superimposed on that [knowledge]. (40–41)

---

9 *upagantavyam* agrees with *sukhādi*.

10 Lit.: "an abode of manifestation".

11 Lit.: "the place of its appearance" (*vyakti*).

paritas tattaraṅgaughasātmatāṃ samupāśrite |
tathāpi jagadānandasundare bodhabhairave ||42||
bhāvanirbharatāmātrasaṃtṛpte śaktiśālini |
pūrṇayā nijaśaktyaiva nyakkṛte śaktimatpade ||43||
tādṛg eva vimarśātmā jñānadhārā vijṛmbhate |
yasyāṃ bhogopadeśena ko 'pi hlādaḥ pravartate ||44||
yadīyasaṃvidācāracaryāvisrambhabhāvitaḥ |
bhogavrāto 'pi dhanyānāṃ niḥśreyasapadāyate ||45||
yatrocyate svaśaktyādikṣobhasaṃraṃbhanirbharā |
devasya yāgapriyatā viśeṣān mātṛmadhyataḥ ||46||
aiśvaryaśaktyudrekeṇa labdheśvarapadābhidhaḥ |
devo vijñānamahimā prodbhūto 'yaṃ prapañcitaḥ ||47||
atrāpy anantabhāvāṃśasaṃyojanaviyojane |
prāgdaśābhedasaṃdhānād asaṃkhyatvam upāśrite ||48||
tadupādhivaśād eva saṃvijjñānapadojjhitāḥ |
tāyante vividhāḥ śāstrakriyājñānavibhūtayaḥ ||49||
mukhyas tv eṣa prapañco 'yaṃ pañcātmatvena carcitaḥ |
tathā ca vakṣyate tattvam abhinnam api pañcadhā ||50||
savyāpārādhipatvena taddhīnaprerakatvataḥ |
icchānivṛtteḥ svasthatvād ityādyair vākyasaṃcayaiḥ ||51||
nanv etāvati sandarbhe deśakālakalākṛtāḥ |
bhedā na saṃbhavanty eva bāḍham om iti vacmahe ||52||
na hy atra kālatattvasya nāmamātraṃ vibhāvyate |
vaibhavy api mahākālī śaktir nātra vijṛmbhate ||53||
tarhy abhinne svasaṃpūrṇe tadā paścāt punar yadā |
parataś ceti ko nv eṣa vācoyuktiparigrahaḥ ||54||

42b sātmatāṃ: *mātmatāṃ* K J_1. 43c pūrṇayā: *pūjayā* K. 44c yasyāṃ: *yasyā* J_1. 46b kṣobha: *kṣo<bha>* J_1^2. 46d viśeṣān mātṛ: *viśeṣātmā tri* J_1. 48c prāg: *prag* K_{ed} (misprint). 49b ojjhitāḥ (*conj.*): ojjhitā K_{ed} J_2, *ojjhitaḥ* K. 51a ādhipatvena: *ādhipatvena* J_1. 51b dhīna: *dhī*[–] J_1. 51c svasthatvād: *svacchatvād* K_{ed}. 52a etāvati: *etāvanti* J_1. 53c api: repeated on the next folio J_2. 54a tarhy: *tat hy* J_2. 54c ceti ko nv eṣa: *caitikonmeṣa* K. 54c ko: *ke* J_1.

As soon as Bhairava who is knowledge becomes entirely identified with the flood of waves of objects (*tat*), but [remains] beautified by universal bliss, [when he] as the proprietor of his power is satisfied with no less than the plenitude of things, when this state of having a power is subordinated by means of his full, own power alone, then such a stream of knowledge consisting of articulation (*vimarśa*), in which an extraordinary bliss (*hlāda*) appears through instruction in enjoyment (*bhoga*), pervades [everything].[12] (42–44)

For the fortunate ones even the multitude of enjoyments, if cultivated by confidence in this (*yadīya*) performance of the 'practice of consciousness', are transformed into an abode of salvation. (45)

As it is said [in the *Sarvajñānottara*], "God's desire for worship is excessive (*nirbhara*) through the intensity of agitation of his own power etc., especially (*viśeṣāt*) because he is within [a group of] mothers". Through the increase of his power of sovereignty (*aiśvarya*) he receives the name of the *īśvara* state [i.e. *īśvaratattva*, where *śakti* = *idam* is predominant]. This God whose greatness is knowledge[13] appears and becomes manifold (*pra-pañc*). (46–47)

Even in this state, the conjunction and separation of constituent endless things become innumerable by combination (*saṃdhāna*) with the division of the earlier state. Only by virtue of these limiting adjuncts the various riches (*vibhūti*) of action and knowledge in the Śāstra give up the state of knowing consciousness [inwardly] to spread [in an objective form]. (48–49)

But [despite this multitude] the principal diversification is considered to be fivefold. As it will be said [later in the MVT] that "reality, although undivided, is fivefold," "because [it] is equipped with activity, with sovereignty, with an impelling force free of both, because of the cessation of will and because of independence." (50–51)

[Opp:] Then it would follow that divisions caused by space, time and [limited] power of action are not possible in this collection [of primary realities]. [A:] We certainly do agree, for there the *tattva* [called] 'time' is not known even by name. Although she pervades everything, the great goddess of time (*mahākālī*) does not manifest here. (52–53)

[Opp:] Then why do you accept the use of the words 'then', 'later', 'again', 'when' and 'afterwards' with reference to [something that is] undivided and complete in itself? (54)

---

12 Or: "unfolds".

13 The knowledge of *śuddhavidyā* which is in this state about to appear.

atra brūmaḥ satyam eva vastutas tu sphuṭātmani |
jṛmbhite tattvasarge 'pi kāle 'py unmiṣitātmani ||55||
bodhasya naiva santy etāḥ pūrvāparavikalpanāḥ |
kālo viśeṣaṇatvena yasmād bhavati bhedakaḥ ||56||
viśeṣaṇaṃ ca tat proktaṃ samaśīrṣikayaiva yat |
bhedena vedyatām eti yathā nīlaṃ saroruhaṃ ||57||
na ca bodhasya vedyatvaṃ kadācid upapadyate |
vedyatvaṃ bhāsamānatvaṃ tat prakāśaprasādataḥ ||58||
prakāśaḥ sa sa bodhaś ca na ced bodhāntarasthiteḥ |
prakāśaniyamān nūnam anavasthā pravartate ||59||
ata eva vimūḍhā ye bodham aprathamānakam |
arthaprathātmakaṃ brūyuḥ svavacovañcitās tu te ||60||
tasmāt kālo na bodhasya bhedakatvāya kalpate |
nāpi vedyasya kālo 'sau bhedakībhavituṃ kṣamaḥ ||61||
viśvaṃ hi bodhābhinnaṃ tad atathātve na bhāsate |
prakāśena samāviṣṭaś citraṃ bhāvaḥ prakāśate ||62||
viśvaprakāśa evaṃ syāt sarvasyaiva sadātanaḥ |
sati prakāśe bodhākhye sa prakāśatvam aśnute ||63||
aprakāśo 'pi bhāvaś cet prakāśātmā sa vedyate |
aprakāśas tv asau bhāva ity atra śaraṇaṃ tamaḥ ||64||
yaś cāprakāśo bhāvātmā prakāśātmā sa cet kṛtaḥ |
nūnaṃ sa bhāvo naṣṭaḥ syāt svāprakāśatvavicyuteḥ ||65||
nātadrūpaṃ prakāśaṃ ca kartuṃ vidhir api kṣamaḥ |
nanv etāvad idaṃbhāvaḥ prakāśe sati bhāsate ||66||
astv etad eva kiṃtv ittham aprakāśaḥ prakāśatām |
bhāvasya cāprakāśatve prakāśībhāvite sati ||67||
naivaṃ prakāśito bhāva iti vastusthitir bhavet |

55a eva: *evaṃ* J_1. 55d kāle: *kālo* K. 55d unmiṣitā: *unmiṣatā* J_1. 57c bhedena: *bhedye na* J_1. 59a prakāśaḥ sa sabodhaś: *prakāśasamabodhaś* J_{Σ}. 59b na (*conj.*): *sa* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 59c prakāśaniyamān (*conj.* TORELLA): *prakāśāniyamān* K_{ed} *prākāśānimayān* K, *prakāśānamiyān* J_{Σ}. 60b bodham: *bodha*† J_1. 62a bodhābhinnaṃ: *bhedābhinnaṃ* J_{Σ}. 62c prakāśena: *prakāśenā* J_{Σ}. 63a evaṃ: *eva* J_1. 65b sa: *ma* corrected to *sa* J_1^2. 65d svāprākaśatva: *svaprakāśatva* K J_2. 66c nanv etāvad: *nanu tāvad* K_{ed}. 67d prakāśī: *prakāśe* J_1.

[A:] We say that this is correct, but in reality these concepts of earlier and later do not exist for knowledge, even if the creation of *tattvas* has manifested perceptibly and time has unfolded. The reason is that time can divide [only] by being a qualifier [of something else]; and a qualifier [such as, for instance, a colour] is taught to be something which is distinctly (*bhedena*) perceptible only as coextensive [with something else], like 'a blue water-lily'. (55–57)

But it is never possible to perceive knowledge, as to be perceived something must appear; [but] this [appearance] is due to the grace of the light [of consciousness]. This [appearance] is light and it is knowledge; if not, it would be different from knowledge and the resulting limitation of light would indeed cause an infinite regress. (58–59)

Consequently those deluded people who describe knowledge not as expanding [to become the object], [but as] consisting of the expansion [i.e. manifestation] of the object, are deceived by their own words. (60)

Therefore time is unable to cause differentiation in consciousness, nor is this time capable of becoming a differentiator [i.e. differentiating quality] of the object of perception. For the universe does not exist outside of knowledge, otherwise it (*tad*) would not appear. (61–62ab)

[If we say that] objects[14] appear variously, because they are pervaded by light, then the world would be manifest (*viśvaprakāśa*) to everyone all the time. [But] if there is light which is called knowledge [i.e. light belonging to the subject], the [object] becomes manifest. (62cd–63)

If, however, [one were to suppose that] an object is different from light, it would [still] be cognized as having light as its essence. For if we say 'this object is without light' [i.e. does not manifest], the doctrinal position (*śaraṇa*) would be darkness [i.e. ignorance of the object]. (64)

But if [theoretically speaking] this non-light, which has the nature of an object, would manifest, it would certainly disappear, because its nature, which is to be without light, would perish. And even the Creator is unable to turn something into light which is not [already] of the nature of light. (65–66ab)

[Opp:] But so far [your position means only that] the state of objectivity appears as soon as there is light. (66cd)

[A:] This might be the case, but the reality (*vastusthitiḥ*) is that in this way something different from light would shine, and if the nature of [this] object, which is to be different from light, would become light [i.e. manifest], then it would not be this object, that is manifested. (67–68ab)

---

14 *jātau ekavacanam.*

tad alaṃ vyatiriktena prakāśena śivas tathā ||68||
tasmāt prakāśa evāsau gīto yaḥ paramaḥ śivaḥ |
sa evācintyamahimā svātantryoddāmaghūrṇitaḥ ||69||
prakāśate tathā tais taiḥ svabhāvair acyutasthitiḥ |
nātra sarvatra sarvajñabhāvaḥ kaścana śaṅkyate ||70||
ahaṃ caitro ghaṭaṃ vedmi na paṭaṃ, veda taṃ tv ayaṃ. |
nāyaṃ vetti paṭaḥ, so 'haṃ jāne ghaṭapaṭāv iti ||71||
vediṣyāmi na vā, pūrvam ajānāṃ naiva vā kvacit,
krameṇa vedmi yugapad dvābhyām ubhayavarjitam. ||72||
sarvaṃ vedmi, na kiṃcic ca jāne. naivāsmi kaścana |
bhāvātmā, nanu naivāham. ahaṃ sarvaṃ ca sarvadā. ||73||
sarvam asmy aham evaikaḥ kiṃ sarvam itarad bhavet |
ityādir eka evāyaṃ prakāśaḥ pravijṛmbhate ||74||
nanv eko yady asaḥ kaścit, prakāśo na tadā paraḥ |
kathaṃ bhaved. aho mūḍhaḥ kathaṃ vyutpādyatām ayam ||75||
ekaḥ prakāśaḥ svātantryāc citrarūpaḥ prakāśate. |
vastutaś ca na citro 'sau, nācitro bhedadūṣaṇāt ||76||
ghaṭaprakāśe vastrasya prakāśo yadi saṃbhavet |
nāsau ghaṭaprakāśaḥ syād dviprakāśo hy asau bhavet ||77||
so 'pi cāstv eva, no nāsti tad idaṃ tvatpracoditam |
ghaṭātmanā prakāśo 'sya mā bhūd ity avatiṣṭhate ||78||
tac cāyuktaṃ prakāśasya bodhatvāt svātmajṛmbhaṇam |
lakṣaṇaṃ yadi tat ko 'yaṃ vṛthā vāgjālaḍambaraḥ ||79||
paricchinnaprakāśatvaṃ jaḍasya kila lakṣaṇam |
jaḍād vilakṣaṇo bodho yato na parimīyate ||80||
tasmād arkasya sadbhāve siddhe kaḥ khalu bāliśaḥ |
brūyāt katham ayaṃ svāṃśuśubhritāśeṣabhūr iti ||81||

69d svātantryoddāma: *svatantryāddhama* J₁. 71b tv ayam: *dvayam* K_{ed}. 72a pūrvam: *purvaṃm* J₁. 72b ajānāṃ (*conj.*): *ajānan* K_{ed} J_Σ. 72d varjitam: *tarjitam* J_Σ. 74b sarvam itarad: *sarvaṃmitarad* J₂. 74d pravijṛmbhate: *provijṛmbhate* J₂. 75a yady asaḥ: *yadi saḥ* J₁. 76c vastutaś ca: *vastutas tu* J₁. 77b unclear marginal note in J₁. 78a cāstv eva (*conj.*): *cāsty eva* K_{ed} J₁, *cāstvaiva* J₂. 80 = *Bodhapañcadaśikā* 8. 81c brūyād: *bhūyāt* J₂. 81d śeṣa: *meṣa* J₂.

So forget about [the theory of] a separate light; it is for this reason (*tasmād*) that Śiva is in this way (*tathā*) described as only light. The highest Śiva alone (*ya … sa*) shines with inconceivable power and moves around without restraint because of his autonomy. In this way he is not impaired by the various forms in which he appears. (68cd–70ab)

[However,] this does not imply[15] that there is also some kind of omniscience in everything [for we see differing limited experiences, e.g.] 'I, Caitra,[16] perceive the pot, not the cloth.' But 'he [i.e. someone else] perceives it.' 'This cloth does not perceive [anything].' 'I know both pot and cloth.' 'I will perceive or I will not'. 'I have known before, or sometimes [I have] not.' 'I come to know gradually, suddenly, in both [and] neither ways.' 'I know everything', and 'I know nothing.' 'I do not have the nature of an object', 'certainly (*nanu*) I do not exist' and 'I am always everything.' 'I, being one, am the world; how can the world be different [from me].' In these and other ways this one light appears [variously]. (70cd–74)

[Opp:] If there is any single thing that is not this light (*asaḥ*), how could it be that there is not some other light?

[A:] O, how can this fool be instructed? It is only a single light that spontaneously (*svātantryāt*) appears in various forms. But in reality it is not manifold. [It is also] not undifferentiated, because this is disproved by the diversity [we perceive]. (75–76)

[Opp:] If the light of a cloth would exist in the light of a pot, it would cease to be the light of a pot, for it would be a double light. Such a thing may exist, [but] what you have described does not exist for us. [The objection] that the light of the [garment] in the form of a pot is not possible remains. (77–78)

[A:] But that is wrong. The light, as it is knowledge, pervades (*jṛmbh*) one's own self. Since this is its characteristic, [your] deceiving verbosity[17] is useless. (79)

It is said that the characteristic of matter is the fact that its light is limited. Knowledge [i.e. consciousness] is different from matter, for it cannot be delimited. (80)

Therefore, as the existence of the sun is proved, who will be so foolish to say: 'How is it possible that the whole earth is illumined by its own rays?' (81)

15 Lit.: "It is not assumed."

16 Caitra is commonly used for "any person", "X".

17 More literally: "pompous mesh of words".

tasmāt siddhe prakāśe 'smin yāḥ prakāśavikalpanāḥ |
sarvās tāḥ sarvasaṃbhuktayoṣiccāritrapālanāḥ ||82||
asiddhau ca prakāśasya ko 'haṃ kiṃ tvaṃ tamo 'pi kim |
na kiṃcid api vā kiṃ syāt tūṣṇīṃ syād api vā katham ||83||
tasmāt prakāśatādātmyalabdhabhairavabhāginām |
bhāvānām api kālo 'yaṃ na kiṃcit kartum arhati ||84||
hanta tarhi kathaṃkāraṃ tadetyādivacaḥkramaḥ |
śrūyatām uktam apy etat punar nirbhajya bhaṇyate ||85||
yaḥ prakāśaḥ sa evāyaṃ pratibhāti tathā tathā |
naiva cānyasya kasyāpi sa tu bhāty eva kevalam ||86||
sa eva paramodāraḥ sarvasyaivāvabhāsakaḥ |
svatantra iti tasyecchāśaktiḥ svātantryasaṃjñitā ||87||
sa ca svātmani viśrāntas tadanyābhāvayogataḥ |
svātmaviśrāntir evaiṣā devasyānanda ucyate ||88||
svātantryamahimaivāsya svarūpād apṛthaksthitiḥ |
svaprakāśe nije dhāmni bhāsayed bhāvavibhramān ||89||
bhāsanā ca kriyāśaktir iti śāstreṣu kathyate |
yayā vicitratattvādikalanā pravibhajyate ||90||
bhāsanānavabhāte ca kathaṃ nāma prakalpate |
tad asyāntaḥsthitaṃ bhānaṃ jñānaśaktir ahaṃ smṛtā ||91||
etāvad asya devasya yad rūpaṃ svātmamātrataḥ |
sa unmeṣa iti proktaḥ pañcaśaktis tato vibhuḥ ||92||
triśaktir ekaśaktir vā devo vā kevalaḥ sthitaḥ |
śaktir evātha devī sā sāraśāstre nirūpyate ||93||

82b vikalpanāḥ: *vikalpanā* J_2. 82c sarvās: *tasmāt* K_{ed} J_2. 85d nirbhajya: *nibhajya* J_2. 86b pratibhāti: *bhāti bhāti* with *prati* in the margin J_1^2. 86d sa tu: *sattā* J_1. 87d śaktiḥ: *śakti* K. 89a mahimai: *mahimā* K_{ed}. 90b śāstreṣu: *śāstraṣu* J_1. 91a bhāte: *bhātaṃ* J_1. 91b prakalpate: *prakalpanaṃ* J_1. 92d pañca: *paṃ<ca>* J_1. 93d sāra (*conj.* SANDERSON): *sā ca* K_{ed}, *sā sā* J_Σ.

Therefore, as the light is proved, all deviating concepts are [like] following the behaviour of an [unfaithful] woman who has sexual relationships with everyone [although her husband is 'proved']. (82)

If the light did not exist, who would I be? Would you exist, would there be darkness or would nothing at all exist? Or how could it [even] be silent? (83)

For this reason, time cannot bring about anything [i.e. any difference] even in objects, since they are part of Bhairava through their identification with light. (84)

[Opp:] But how, for heaven's sake, can there be the use of words [denoting time] like 'then' etc. [in your account of reality]? (85ab)

[A:] Listen! Though this has been said [before], it is again stated in detail. (85cd)

This same light appears in various ways; but never for anything else [i.e. it does not illuminate an independent object], for it alone shines. (86)

This [light], as it is absolutely superior (*paramodāraḥ*), manifests everything. Because it is autonomous, its power of will is called 'autonomy'. (87)

And it rests in its own self, because nothing that is different from it can exist.[18] This "resting in one's own self" is called bliss of God. (88)

The power of its autonomy lies in the fact that [even in the process of manifestation, which implies duality] it is never separate from its own nature. [For] it is in its own realm of self-light, that it causes the confusing beauty[19] of the world to appear. (89)

This activity of manifesting [objects] is called 'power of action' in the Śāstras. It is responsible for the self-differentiation (*kalanā*) [of light] into various *tattvas* etc. How could this manifestation possibly take place in something unmanifested (*anavabhāte*)? Therefore the inner appearance of it is the 'power of knowledge', which is called 'I'. (90–91)

Up to this point the form of God, which rests in his own self alone, is called 'awakening' (*unmeṣa*); therefore the pervading Lord has five powers. (92)

[For the purpose of worship] he [is described as having] three powers or one power, or [as being the one] God alone. Or (*atha*) there is power alone which is described in the *Sāraśāstra* as the Goddess. (93)

---

18 Lit.: "because of (*yogataḥ*) the non-existence of [something] that is different from it."

19 Taking *vibhrama* as a *śleṣa*.

vakṣyate ca jagaddhātuḥ kathitetyāditaḥ param |
saivaikā saty anekatvaṃ gacchatīti maheśinā ||94||
sa cāyaṃ nirbharānandaviśrāntisvātmasusthitaḥ |
sodaryaiḥ śabdasaṃdarbhair bhāṣyate bhairavādibhiḥ ||95||
savidhaṃ dūragaṃ vāpi yady apy asya na vastutaḥ |
śabdajātaṃ bhavet kiṃcid anyad apy athavā prabhoḥ ||96||
tathā ca bhāsayaty eva deva eṣa tathā tathā |
tatas tadanusāreṇa sarvo 'yaṃ kalpanākramaḥ ||97||
na ca tat kalpanāmātraṃ tathātve 'py atha kā kṣitiḥ |
tathā saṃkalpatāṃ devo yad vā kalpayatāṃ tathā ||98||
evaṃ caiṣa prakāśātmā saptatriṃśātmakāt paraḥ |
vaicitryabhāsanāṃ kurvan kālaṃ bhāsayati prabhuḥ ||99||
vaicitryabhāsanaiveyaṃ kālaśaktir udāhṛtā |
tato 'vabhāsamānaitatkālaśaktyanurodhataḥ ||100||
āsmākīnāt tadetyādir uparāgaḥ pravartate |
na cāsau tatra nāsty eva tatra yan nāsti tat kutaḥ ||101||
anyatra tanyatāṃ nāma tat prakāśavaśaṃ sthitam |
nanv evam apare tattvajāle śuddhetarasthitau ||102||
śuddhāśuddhapade vāpi vidyādau tattvamaṇḍale |
śuddhabhairavasadbhāvād aviśeṣo bhaviṣyati ||103||
narīnṛtyāmahe hanta yatnād vyākhyeyam eva naḥ |
āyuṣmato yad dhṛdaye svayaṃ viparivartate ||104||
śuddhāśuddhavibhedo hi paramārthakathāsu no |
sa tu tatkṛta evāste mūḍhānāṃ dhiyi niścalaḥ ||105||

94c saivaikā saty anekatvaṃ: *saikā saty anekatvaṃ vai* K_{ed} J_2. 95a sa cāyaṃ: *madāyaṃ* corrected to *sa cāyaṃ* J_1^2. 95c saṃdarbhair: *saṃdharbhai* J_1. 96b vastutaḥ: *vastunaḥ* J_{Σ}. 98b kṣitiḥ: *kṣatiḥ* J_{Σ}. 98c devo: *deva* K. 99b saptatriṃśātmakāt: *saptatriṃśātmakaḥ* J_1. 99d prabhuḥ: oṃ J_2. 100a vaicitrya: *vaicitryā* J_1. 101a āsmākīnāt: *āsmakīnāt* K_{ed}, *āmmākīnāt* corrected to *āsmākīnāt* J_1^2. 101a tadety: *udety* J_2. 102b sthitam (*conj.* TORELLA): hitam K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 102b sthitam up to dvaitam i- (114c), i.e. folio 8, missing J_2. 103cd sadbhāvād aviśeṣo: *sadbhāvam avaśeṣo* J_1.

And Śiva will say [in the *Mālinītantra*, in a later passage] starting from '[this power] of the creator of the world is said [to be inherent in him]': 'She, being one, becomes many'. (94)

And God (*ayam*), being perfectly established in himself through a state of rest in a bliss replete [with all things], is denoted by many (*saṃdarbha*) appropriate (*sodarya*) terms such as, for instance, "Bhairava". (95)

Even if it is nearer [to him] or further away [from him], the group of words (*śabdajātam*), or anything else, does not actually (*vastutaḥ*) pertain to this omnipotent God (*asya …prabhoḥ*). Thus this God manifests in various ways; therefore the whole process of conceptualization [can] only follow this [manifestation]. (96–97)

And [on the other hand] it is not merely conceptualization. Even if it were, [our doctrine] would not be impaired: God may form concepts in this way or he may cause others to do so. (98)

And in this way [Śiva], who is essentially light, is higher than the thirty-seventh [*tattvam*]. (99ab)

[It is only] by causing the appearance of diversity that the Lord manifests time. This manifestation of diversity is termed 'the power of time'. Thus it is because of our (*āsmākīnāt*) accordance (*anurodhataḥ*) with Śiva's (*etat*) power of time manifesting that qualifications[20] [of time referred to by words] like 'then' etc. exist. (99cd–101ab)

It is not [the case], that [time] does not exist in [Śiva] at all, [for] how can anything exist except in him. It could spread in another reality [and] would still be dependent on light. (101cd–102ab)

[Opp:] If it were as you say, [it would follow that], since the pure Bhairava [would] exist in the lower impure (*śuddhetara*) group of *tattvas*, or in the group of *tattvas* that is intermediate between purity and impurity (*śuddhāśuddha*), [i.e.] impure knowledge and [the remaining *kañcukas*], there would be no difference [between them]. (102cd–103)

[A:] We dance out of joy now! What we would have had to explain laboriously, is already[21] present in your mind.[22] (104)

The distinction between pure and impure has no place in discussions of the highest reality. But caused by [the necessities of] those [discussions], it is entrenched in the mind of the ignorant. (105)

---

20 Lit.: "colorations".

21 Lit.: "spontaneously" (*svayam*).

22 Lit.: "moves around in your heart."

nanu śuddhetaratvākhyo yadi bhedo na vāstavaḥ |
vyācikīrṣitam evaitac chāstraṃ vivadate tataḥ ||106||
aśuddhatvaṃ hi tattvānāṃ dīkṣayā śodhanaṃ tataḥ |
ityādi bahudhā bhedapradhānātra yataḥ sthitiḥ ||107||
ucyate nādvaye 'muṣmin dvaitaṃ nāsty eva sarvathā |
uktaṃ hi bhedavandhye 'pi vibhau bhedāvabhāsanam ||108||
tad eva khalu saṃsāre māyāvidyādibhiḥ padaiḥ |
bandha ity ucyate tatra rūḍhāḥ saṃsāriṇo matāḥ ||109||
taccintānusṛter eṣāṃ śuddhāśuddhādiniścayaḥ |
kiṃca śāstram idaṃ samyag bhagavadyogadeśakam ||110||
bhagavadyogam advaitaṃ nirdvandvaṃ ca pracakṣate |
tasyopadeśa itthaṃ syād yadi yāvadvibhedavat ||111||
saṃbhāvyate tan nirbhajya nirbhajyaiva nirūpyate |
advaite bhairavavibhau yat praveśopaveśayoḥ ||112||
ābhyāsikī sthitir nāsti tau hi bhedaikajīvitau |
ataḥ saṃbhāvyanikhiladvaitaśaṅkāvyapohane ||113||
gurūṇāṃ ca śiśūnāṃ ca yatnaḥ sarvo vijṛmbhate |
ato dvaitam ihāśaṅkyāśaṅkya sarvaṃ pratanyate ||114||
tad yāvadgati saṃbhāvya na tu kutrāpy udāsyate |
tathā hi yadi nāmṛṣṭaṃ dvaitaṃ tarhy ekam eva sat ||115||
cidbrahma tad alaṃ tattvasaṃkhyākalpananirṇayaiḥ |
pañcatriṃśatitā kasmāt tattvānāṃ tan nirūpyate ||116||
tasmād dvaitasya bhedātmasthiter yāvadgati graham |
kṛtvā yas tatpratikṣepas tena niḥśaṅkatā bhavet ||117||
etad eva ca vijñāne nirbhidyaivopadeśanam |
yathāsaṃbhavi yad vajrapakṣāṇāṃ tad vidāraṇam ||118||

107d sthitiḥ: *sthitaḥ* J_1. 109a saṃsāre: *saṃsāro* K_{ed}. 109c bandha: *gandha* J_1 K. 110a sṛter: *sṛtair* K_{ed}. 110a eṣāṃ: *eṣa* J_1. 112a nirbhajya (*conj.* SANDERSON): nirbhaktyā K_{ed} J_1. 112c advaite: *advaita* K_{ed}. 114b sarvo: *sarvaṃ* K_{ed}. 115b kutrāpy: *tatrāpy* K_{ed}. 116a tattva: *sattva* J_{Σ}. 116c pañcatriṃśatitā (*conj.*): *pañcaviṃśatitā* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 118c tad (*conj.*): *yad* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 118d yad (*conj.*): *tad* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 118d vidāraṇam: *vidhāraṇam* J_1, *vicāraṇam* J_2.

[Opp:] If [you say that] the division which is called 'purity and impurity' is unreal, then [it must be objected that] the very Śāstra you wish to explain contradicts this. (106)

Because here existence (*sthiti*) is predominantly dualistic, [as is] frequently [demonstrated] by such [teachings] as the impurity of the *tattvas* and therefore the purification through initiation. (107)

[A:] [In reply] we teach [as follows]: it is not [the case] that duality is completely absent from this non-duality, for it is taught that an appearance of duality takes place in the pervading Lord, although he is free from diversity. (108)

This is indeed called bondage to the world [of transmigration] with words like *māyā* and ignorance. Those who are immersed in it are called 'transmigratory souls' (*saṃsārin*) [and] their firm belief (*niścaya*) in pure and impure and other [dichotomies] stem from anxiety about *saṃsāra* (*tat*). (109–110ab)

Moreover this Śāstra teaches the Yoga of Śiva (*bhagavad*) thoroughly (*samyag*). This Yoga of Śiva is said to be non-dualistic and beyond dichotomies. Instruction in this [Yoga] is given in this way: if [something] is imagined to have a certain amount (*yāvat*) of division, it is explained by analysing it again and again. (110cd–112ab)

For there is no practice (*ābhyāsikī sthitiḥ*) for entering into and remaining in (*upaveśa*) the pervading Bhairava who is without duality, as both [entering and remaining] are completely dependent on duality. (112cd–113ab)

Therefore all the efforts made by teachers and disciples serve only to remove the inhibition (*śaṅkā*) caused by all the duality they imagine. It is for this reason that everything [taught] in [this Śāstra] (*iha*) is unfolded by supposing duality again and again. (113cd–114)

But (*tu*) by supposing it one's whole life (*yāvadgati*), one never becomes indifferent to it [as the Vedāntin attempts to become]. For if duality does not become conscious, absolute consciousness (*cidbrahma*) [remains] as the one existent. Then there would be no use for an enumeration, construction and determination of *tattvas*. Why should thirty-five *tattvas* [below Śiva] then be considered? (115–116)

Therefore having accepted (*grahaṃ kṛtvā*) duality, which exists (*sthiti*) as division, all one's life, one should become free from inhibitions only (*yas … tena*) through rejecting it. (117)

And this [is taught] in the Vijñāna[-Bhairavatantra]: the instruction (*upadeśanam*) [that is given there] after piercing through [them] as far as possible is the crushing of [these] adamantine notions. (118)

tathā hi śrīmatā stotre bhaṭṭanārāyaṇena tat |
namas te bhavasaṃbhrāntabhrāntim udbhāvya bhindate ||119||
jñānānandaṃ ca nirdvandvaṃ deva vṛtvā vivṛṇvate |
nirdvandvam iti nirdvaitaṃ prakaṭīkriyate padam ||120||
udbhāvyante bhramāś ceti cakāro 'trādbhutāvahaḥ |
iha cādvaitam eveti purataḥ prataniṣyate ||121||
adhvaśuddhyādikaṃ dvaite 'nupapattīti vakṣyate |
abhedena vinā naitan nanu bhedaṃ vināpi kim ||122||
satyaṃ kiṃtv advaye tattve bhedo 'pi na na yujyate |
idaṃ hi tat parādvaitaṃ bhedatyāgagrahau na yat ||123||
bhede tu viśvabhāvānāṃ svasvabhāvavyavasthiteḥ |
abheda iti śabdo 'yaṃ manye bhedayate rasāt ||124||
tad alaṃ prakṛtaṃ nirūpyate
parameśaḥ kila bhedakalpanām |
prakaṭīkurute yathā tathā
nanu kālo 'pi vijṛmbhate tathā ||125||
na tathāpi ca yāti bhinnatāṃ
paramārthena kadācid eva saḥ |
yugapat sa hi saṃvidātmakaḥ
'svātantryād bahudhā prakāśate ||126||
nanv ittham ekaghanabhāvavimarśasāre
saṃvedane yad aham eṣa karomi citraḥ |
jānāmi vā tad apare 'pi na maitracaitra-
prāyā vidadhyur athavāpi kathaṃ na vidyuḥ ||127||
aho māyāgranthir nibiḍatama eṣo 'tra bhavatām
idaṃ hi prabrūmaḥ svaparam iha nāsty ekam abhidam |
ahaṃ vedmīty eṣā ghaṭatanuviśeṣaprakaṭatā
prathāś citrākārāḥ paramahasi bhāntīti kathitam ||128||

119a śrīmatā: *śrīmatāḥ* J_1. 119cd–120ab = *Stavacintāmaṇi* 71. 123a kiṃtv advaye (J_1, GNOLI, *Tantrasāra*, p. 41): *kiṃtu dvaye* K_{ed} J_2. 123b na na: *nanu* J_2. 124d bhedayate: *bhedayato* J_2. 124d rasāt (*conj.*): *rasān* K_{ed}, *rasām* J_{Σ}. 126a thāpi up to sthitiṃ (133d), i.e. folio 10, is missing in J_2. 126d svātantryād is unmetrical. All manuscripts read a gloss after this verse: *kramakālavivarjanāśayaṃ yugapacchabdam imaṃ* (*idaṃ* J_1) *prayuñjate* |. 127c vā: *kiṃ* J_1. 127d vidadhyur: *vividyur* J_1. 128b abhidam: *abhidham* J_1.

For Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa has clarified this (*tat*) state beyond duality (*nirdvaitaṃ padam*) [with the word] 'beyond dichotomies' in his hymn:

"I adore you, o Lord, who creates the erroneous perception for those who are deluded by the world [only in order to] destroy it[23] and [thereby] veils and unveils the bliss of knowledge which is beyond dichotomies." (119–120)

The word 'and' in "erroneous perceptions are created and [destroyed]" creates the [poetical sense of] wonder. (121ab)

And it will be explained later that in this system only non-duality exists. It will be said that the purification of the *adhvan*, for instance, is inexplicable in a dualistic system. (121cd–122ab)

[Opp:] [We can agree that the purification of the *adhvan*] is not [explicable] without non-duality, but is it [explicable] without duality? (122cd)

[A:] This is correct, but even duality is not impossible in the non-dual reality. For the supreme non-duality [is not the absence of duality, but] exists, when (*yat*) there is neither rejection nor acceptance of duality. (123)

But [in the sphere] of duality of all things, I think, the firmness of their own individual natures will automatically (*rasāt*) cause the word 'non-dual' to become something dual. (124)

But enough; we shall [now] expound the main topic: it has been said (*kila*) that as much as (*yathā tathā*) the highest Lord causes the construction of plurality to appear, indeed also time appears. (125)

But still he is never divided in the real sense. For, [as] he is consciousness, he simultaneously appears manifold [because of his autonomy[24]]. (126)

[Opp:] If sentience (*saṃvedana*) exists in the way [described] as the essence of a homogeneous awareness of being (*bhāva*), then how [do you explain] that what I, who am manifold (*citraḥ*),[25] do or know, is not also done or even known more or less by all the others. (127)

[A:] Tight indeed is the knot of illusion on this point (*atra*) in you! For we teach this: in our system (*iha*) 'own' and 'other' do not exist; the one [reality] is undivided (?*abhida*). The fact that I perceive means that the characteristics that form a pot[26] are manifest. As has been said [before,] various manifestations appear in the highest light. (128)

---

23 Lit.: "who, having created …. destroys [it]" (*bhindate*: dative of the present participle).

24 This translates the metrically wrong *svātantryāt*.

25 Or emend to *citram* (suggestion by TORELLA).

26 Lit.: "that are the body of a pot."

tasmād ghaṭaṃ vedmy aham ity amutra
bhedo na kaścin nanu me ghaṭo 'yam |
bhātīti bhedapratibhānam asti
naitan na tasyaiṣa śivas tathāyam ||129||
ata eva dvaipāyanamukhyās teṣu svaśāstradeśeṣu |
mamakāram eva mṛtyuṃ khaṇḍanadāyitvataḥ prāhuḥ ||130||
tad evaṃ kālakalanopādhijātoparāgajāḥ |
tadetyādi pratāyante paratattve 'pi saṃvidaḥ ||131||
tatra pūrṇaikarūpatvāt sarvaṃ sarvatra cāpi tat |
anyathā khaṇḍanāyogān na pūrṇā pūrṇatā bhavet ||132||
tataḥ pūrṇatayā sarvaṃsahabhairavadhāmani |
pañcātmako 'yaṃ śāstrārthaḥ śāmbhavaḥ. śaktyaṇusthitim ||133||
nyakkṛtyaiṣa parāṃ devīṃ svātmany udrecya vartate |
itthaṃ sa visisṛkṣuḥ san bhāvān visraṣṭṛtāpadāt ||134||
pūrvam ucchalitānandaghanām abhajata sthitim |
visraṣṭṛtāpade tv eṣa visargāveśabhāg api ||135||
riktībhaviṣyann ānandaghanayā pūrṇayā citā |
tāvad ānandaśaktyaṃśavisargāveśanirbharaḥ ||136||
vartamānaḥ svaśaktyoghapūrṇaś cābhūd bhaviṣyati |
riktaśaktir iti tryātmacitrasaṃvedanātmakaḥ ||137||
tadāsau devadevaḥ syād visraṣṭari pade sphuṭam |
nanu kiṃ vartamānāṃśe saṃsto bhūtabhaviṣyatī ||138||
kiṃ nāma bhavatā jñātaṃ te svatantre 'pi kecana |
vartamānāvadher bhūtaṃ bhaviṣyac ca vibhajyate ||139||

133b saha: *mahā* K. 134a aiṣa parāṃ devīṃ (*conj.*): *aiṣā parā devī* J_2 K_{ed}, *aiva parā devī* J_1. 134b udrecya: *udracya* J_2. 134c san: *sa* J_Σ. 134d visraṣṭṛ: *visraṣṭya* J_2. 135c visraṣṭṛ: *visraṣṭya* J_2. 135d visargā: *vimarśa* J_2. 137a vartamānaḥ (*conj.* ISAACSON): *vartamāna* K_{ed} J_Σ. 138d saṃsto: *so 'staṃ* J_2. 139b svatantre: *sve tantre* J_1. 139c āvadher: *āvadhe* J_2.

For this reason [the perception] 'I perceive the pot' does not imply any duality. [Opp:] But in the perception 'The pot is manifest *to me*' duality appears. [A:] It is not so (*naitat*).[27] It does not [appear] to him, this Śiva [appears] in this way. (129)

Therefore Dvaipāyana and others describe in various places (*-deśeṣu*) in their own Śāstras the notion that something belongs to oneself as [equivalent to] death, for it produces division. (130)

In this way, even in the highest reality, cognitions (*saṃvidaḥ*) that are caused under the influence of limiting adjuncts, which are the activity of time, appear as 'then' etc. (131)

And in this [highest reality], because it is always replete,[28] everything is also in everything. Otherwise this entirety would not be full, since division would be possible. (132)

Therefore, on account of its fullness in the all-sustaining light of Bhairava, the sense of the Śāstra [on the level] of Śiva (*śāṃbhava*) is fivefold. By subordinating the level of power and soul, this [God] emphasizes the highest deity [of speech] in his own self. (133–134ab)

So it is that when he wishes to emit the objects [i.e. the world], before (*pūrvam*) [reaching] the condition, in which he creates,[29] he has [already] experienced a state in which the mass of bliss has been stirred (*ucchalita*). (134cd–135ab)

But in the state where he is a creator, when he is absorbed in the emission [of the world] and (*api*) is about to become emptied of the mass of bliss that is his full consciousness, he is (*vartamānaḥ*) completely (*tāvat*[30]) filled with intentness (*āveśa*) to emit, which is part of his power of bliss; he was full of the mass of his own powers; and he will have exhausted his power. Thus (*iti*) the highest deity [Śiva] is manifest in his creative state as the sentience that is diversified threefold [i.e. into past, present and future]. (135cd–138ab)

[Opp:] But how can past and future exist together in an aspect of present time? Surely you understand that they are also independent entities[31] and [that] the past, as well as the future are divided from the present.[32] (138cd–139)

---

27 Among several possibilities this is, as pointed out by Prof. Torella, the most convincing way to construe this verse.

28 Lit.: "Because its form is only full."

29 Lit.: "the state of being a creator".

30 See APTE (1986), s.v.

31 Lit.: "Do you understand them to be something independent".

32 Lit.: "are separated from present time as a limit."

yac ca yatra na viśrāntaṃ tad vibhajyeta vai kutaḥ |
kathaṃ cāvadhibhāvaḥ syād vartamānasya te prati ||140||
tayor avadhimattvaṃ vā tat praty api kathaṃ bhavet |
viśvasya viśvam avadhis tadvad vā jāyate na kim ||141||
tasmād bhūtaṃ bhaviṣyac ca vartamānākhyasaṃvidi |
rūḍham eveti tatraiva yadi viśrāntim āvahet ||142||
yadi cātraiva nikhilakalpanāraśmimaṇḍalam |
avisphārya kṣaṇaṃ tiṣṭhet saṃniruddhanijasthitiḥ ||143||
tan nijāmṛtavisphāracamatkāraikacarvaṇām |
labhate paramānandasudhāsandohavāhinīm ||144||
tathā hi sūryaraśmyoghapūrṇaḥ syāc candramā yadā |
tadā sūryakarān bhūyo yāvan na visisṛkṣati ||145||
tāvat svamaṇḍalābhoge kṣaṇaṃ viśrāntisusthitaḥ |
antaḥsthaviśvadevāṃśatarpaṇāpātram ucyate ||146
evaṃ bhāvaprakāśārkamarīcinicayāñcite |
svabodhacandramahasi vartamāne hṛdantare ||147||
viśrānto 'ntaḥsthitodāracitsudhāsārasundare |
antaḥsthasvāmṛtāpūro vamyate na bahir yataḥ ||148||
tata evāntar evāsau ghūrṇamānaḥ samucchalan |
svāntaḥsthadevatācakratarpaṇāhaṃvidātmakaḥ ||149||
jāyate yāvad uddāmyet tāvat svakaraṇakramaḥ |
niruddhe raśmipaṭale vibhavābhāvayogataḥ ||150||
na bhūtaṃ na bhaviṣyac ca vartamānād vibhajyate |
avibhāgas tayor yāvat tāvat kā vartamānatā ||151||
bhūtabhāvisvabhāvābhyāṃ sā hi yāti vibhāgitām |
tad asmin saṃvidavadhau viśramya tuṭimātrakam ||152||
kālagrāsaparo yogī jāyate khecaraḥ kṣaṇāt |

141a avadhimattvaṃ: *avadhimatve* J_2. 141b tat praty: *tatretv* J_1, *tatraty* J_2. 142d āvahet: *āvaheḥ* J_S. 143c tiṣṭhet: *tiṣṭhes* J_S. 143d saṃ: *sa* J_1. 144c labhate: *labhase* J_1. 146a ābhoge: *ābhogo* J_1. 146b susthitaḥ: *māsthitaḥ* J_1. 148c svāmṛtā: *svāmṛto* J_1. 148d vamyate: *yasyate* J_2, *vasyate* J_1. 150a uddāmyet: *uddāsyet* J_1. 150d vibhavā: *vibhāgā* J_S. 151d varta: *vatu* J_2. 152c saṃvidavadhau: *savivadhau* K. 153a grāsa: *grāma* J_2.

[A:] How can something be divided [from a place] where it does not rest? And how can the present be a limit with regard to these two, or they have a limit with regard to it [the present]? Would not everything become the limit of everything else in this manner (*tadvad*) [i.e. if this were accepted]? (140–141)

For this reason it is said (*iti*) that past and future are immersed in the consciousness that is called present. If one brings about a state of rest in this only, and if the whole circle of rays of conceptualization stand still for one moment without becoming manifest in this [present consciousness], then one has annihilated one's individual (*nija*) existence and relishes (*carvaṇāṃ labhate*) only the vibrant experience[33] [of the nectar] of one's own immortality [i.e. the transcendence of time], [in which] flows an abundance (*saṃdoha*) of ambrosia that is the highest bliss. (142–144)

For, to explain, when the moon is full of the mass of the rays of the sun and does not wish to emit them again, then it is, for a moment, established in a state of rest in the fullness of its own orb. It is [then] called 'vessel for the gratification of all the constituent deities inside [consciousness]'. (145–146)

In this way one rests in the light emitted by the moon of one's own knowledge, [a light] which exists inside the heart [i.e. consciousness], which is made manifest (*añcita*) by the mass of the rays of the sun that illuminates the world and which is beautiful with the essence of the nectar of the vast consciousness inside. Since the flood of one's own inner nectar is not released outside, it is revolving and surging up only inside and acquires (*-ātmakaḥ jāyate*) the knowledge of the 'I', which gratifies the circle of deities inside oneself. As long as [it does this] (*yāvat*), the process of one's sensory perception (*svakaraṇakramaḥ*) is suspended. (147–150ab)

While the mass of rays is restrained, [their] power (*vibhava*) [that causes manifestation] is absent, and consequently[34] neither past nor future is divided from the present. (150cd–151ab)

[But] how [can we speak of] the present, as long as they [past and future] are not divided from it? For it is through the nature of past and future that the present becomes separate. (151cd–152ab)

Therefore (*tad*) when a meditator (*yogī*) intent on devouring time comes to rest in this limit of consciousness for only a moment (*tuṭiḥ*), he at once becomes "one who moves in the void [of consciousness]". (152cd–153ab)

33 Lit.: "the experience of the vibration of nectar".

34 This translates the ablative *yogataḥ*.

uktaṃ hi bhāvābhāso yaḥ kālaḥ sa kalanātmakaḥ ||153||
svasaṃvidraśmisaṃsphāro bhāvābhāvaḥ sa nāparaḥ |
tasmāt svaraśmisaṃrodhadvāraruddhādhvamaṇḍalaḥ ||154||
kālagrāsaikarasiko jāyate khecaraḥ svayam |
tad uktaṃ parameśena tantre śrīḍāmarābhidhe ||155||
niruddhya raśmicakraṃ svaṃ pītvāmṛtam anuttamam |
kālobhayāparicchinne vartamāne sukhī bhavet ||156||
rodho 'pi nāma naitasmin saṃkocaparivarjite |
tadabhāvān na visphāro grāsatṛptī tathātra ke ||157||
kiṃtūktanītyā saṃrodhasphāragrāsādi bhāsate |
na tathābhāsanāc cānyad vastu viśvatra kiṃcana ||158||
ity alaṃ khecarīcakragoṣṭhyālāpena bhūyasā |
ko vābhinavagupte 'smin yogaḥ saṃvedanakrame ||159||
prakṛtaṃ brūmahe devīvisṛṣṭāś citrasaṃvidaḥ |
yāvat tāvad tad ūrdhvordhvaṃ sroto yad bhedavarjitam ||160||
saurabhargaśikhādīni tataḥ śāstrāṇi tenire |
uktaṃ bhargaśikhāyāṃ ca devena parameṣṭhinā ||161||
ūrdhvasrotodbhavaṃ jñānam idaṃ tat paramaṃ priye |
paramadhvaninordhvordhvasaṃvidrūpābhidhāyinā ||162||
īśānavaktraniryātāt siddhāntād bhedam ādiśat |
atrāpi pūrvabhedāṃśavyāmiśrībhāvacitritāḥ ||163||
vijñānasaṃpadas tāṃs tāṃs tanvate śāstravibhramān |

153c bhāvābhāso: *bhāvabhāso* J_{Σ}. 154b bhāvābhāvaḥ: *bhāvābhāsaḥ* J_1. 155a grāsaika: *grāmaika* J_2. 155d ḍāmarā: *bhāmarā* J_2. 156c paricchinne: *paricchino* J_2(the parallel in PTV, p. 35, reads *saṃrudhya* and *-paricchinnaṃ*). 157c visphāro: *visphāra* J_2. 158c cānyad (*conj.* SANDERSON): *cānya* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 159a cakra: *cakraṃ* J_1. 159c vābhi: *vāpi* J_2. 160b sṛṣṭāś: *sṛṣṭā* J_{Σ}. 162a odbhavaṃ: *obhavaṃ* J_{Σ}. 162c ordhva (J_{Σ}; and independently *conj.* SANDERSON): *ordhvaṃ* K_{ed}.

For it is taught that time, which is the appearance of the world, is (*yaḥ … sa*) the vibration (*saṃsphāraḥ*) of the rays of one's own consciousness that is projecting (*kalana*) [the world]. The absence of the world is [also] it [i.e. time], it is nothing else. Therefore one who has restrained all the [six] orders (*adhvan*) by restraining the rays of his own [consciousness], who is completely immersed in the devouring of time, spontaneously (*svayam*) becomes "one who moves in the void [of consciousness]". (153cd–155ab)

This has been said by Śiva (*parameśa*) in the *Śrīḍāmaratantra*: 'After immobilizing one's circle of rays and tasting the supreme nectar he should dwell in bliss within the present that is not divided from both past and future.' (155cd–156)

Even the so-called restraint [of the rays] does not exist in this [present] which is free from contraction. As this is absent, there is no vibration [of the *raśmicakra*] in it, and how could there be [subsequent] devouring and contentment. (157)

But in the manner described [above] restraint, appearance, devouring etc. *appear*. And there is no other reality in the world than appearance in this way. (158)

But enough of this long narration of the [secret] discourse about the *khecarīcakra*; or what is its use (*ko yogaḥ*) for the process of perception, which is hidden ever new [i.e. again and again]? (159)

So let us deal with our topic. When (*yāvat*) the manifold perceptions are emitted by the goddess, they form the stream that is higher than the "upper" [stream] and is free from duality.[35] From it Śāstras like the *Saurabhargaśikhā* are produced. (160–161ab)

And the supreme God teaches in the *Bhargaśikhā*: "O Beloved, this is the knowledge, that stems from the higher stream; *that* is the supreme [knowledge]."

With the word 'supreme', which expresses the form of consciousness *above* the higher stream, he taught that there is a difference between [this highest form of the Śāstra and] the Siddhānta, which issued from the Īśāna face. (161cd–163ab)

Even here, [when] the riches of knowledge become manifold by mingling with parts of earlier divisions, they produce an astonishing multitude of Śāstras.[36] (163cd–164ab)

---

35 Lit.: "Then (*tāvat*) this is the stream which is without duality."

36 "Astonishing multitude" tries to catch both senses of *vibhrama* that are implied here.

iha yāvat tu mukhyeyaṃ ṣaḍātmā śāstrasaṃtatiḥ ||164||
etatpūrvārdhabhāgīni trikaśāstrāṇi yāni tu |
ṣaḍardhasaṃjñayā tāni gurubhir bhāṣitāny alam ||165||
na tu gūḍharahasyatvād evaiṣa vacanakramaḥ |
evaṃ hi dvādaśārdhārdham ityādy api na kiṃ bhavet ||166||
atra śaktitrayaṃ mukhyaṃ saṃpūrṇasthiti kalpate |
ananyonyoparodhena pūrṇaṃ pūrṇacidātmakam ||167||
tataḥ paraṃ tu tritayaṃ kasyāṃcid guṇitājuṣi |
anyasyāṃ guṇatābhāji yāmalaṃ paribhāṣyate ||168||
paścād visṛṣṭe 'rthaughe tadvaicitryopādhiyogataḥ |
pṛthagbhāvaviyogāsu svātmaśaktiṣu pañcasu ||169||
citspandecchāvidākarmarūpāsu svaucitīvaśāt |
pañcabrahmāṅgasubhagāt sphuradbhāvāṃśabodhajam ||170||
rūpaṃ śāstrātmatāṃ prāptaṃ pañcadhaiva vijṛmbhate |
tathā hi prāg anantāntaḥsthitabhāvaughajṛmbhaṇam ||171||
yāvat karoti bhagavāṃs tāvad īśamukhasthitiḥ |
antaḥsthāyā abhinnāyāḥ kriyāśakter vijṛmbhaṇe ||172||
kramād unmiṣite tāvān eṣa sphāraḥ pratāyate |
kriyāśakteḥ sphuṭaḥ sphāro māyātvaṃ pratipatsyate ||173||
māyātattvasvarūpe hi śiveśānīti vakṣyate |
śuddhaśuddhetarāśuddhaviśvanirmāṇakāriṇaḥ ||174||
pañcamantratanoḥ śambhor nirmeyāśuddhasaṃgatiḥ |
asty eva pūrvakoṭyāṃ hi sarvam eva vyavasthitam ||175||
tathā hi svagṛhāt kvāpi yiyāsoḥ prathamakṣaṇe |
yāvat kiṃcana gantavyaṃ yac ca tanmadhyavṛtti tu ||176||

165b trika: *tri<ka>* J$_1$. 166b evaiṣa: *eveṣe* J$_2$. 168b guṇitā (*conj.* SANDERSON): *guṇatā* K$_{ed}$ J$_\Sigma$. 168b juṣi: *jvaṣi* J$_2$. 168c guṇatā: *guṇa* J$_1$. 170a vidā: *vidhā* J$_1$. 170b rūpāsu: *sva* J$_2$. 170c brahmāṅga: *brahmāṃgaṃ* J$_1$. 171c āntaḥ (*conj.*): *ānta* K$_{ed}$ J$_\Sigma$. 173a unmiṣite: *unmiṣate* J$_\Sigma$. 173a tāvān: *bhāvān* J$_\Sigma$. 173d pratipatsyate (J$_\Sigma$K): *pratipadyate* K$_{ed}$. 174b śiveśānīti: *śivaiśānīti* J$_2$. 174c śuddhaśuddhe: *śuddhāśuddhe* K$_{ed}$. 174c tara: *tadā* J$_2$. 176a tathā hi: *tathāpi* J$_2$. 176a kvāpi: *vāpi* J$_2$. 176b prathama: *prathame* J$_1$. 176c gantavyam: *kartavyaṃ* K$_{ed}$.

But here the primary transmission (*santati*) of the Śāstra is only (*yāvat*) six-fold. The Trikaśāstras that form their earlier part are [therefore] adequately designated 'half of six' by the teacher. [It is adequate,] as this expression is not used (*vacanakrama*) because the doctrine (*rahasya*) [of the Trika] is secret, for [in that case] why should there not be [other variants for Trika as] 'half of the half of twelve' in the same way? (164cd–166)

In this system a principal trinity of powers exists, which remains in fullness. As they do not obstruct each other, this [trinity] is replete, [that is,] its nature is replete consciousness. (167)

After [this state of equilibrium], when one [power] is superordinate and the other subordinate, this highest trinity is called 'paired' (*yāmalam*). (168)

Later, when the multitude of objects is created, the five powers of his own being (*svātma*), [i.e.] consciousness, vibration, will, knowledge and action, are separated (*viyoga*) because of their disparate activities (*bhāva*) under the influence of the diversity of these [objects] (*tadvaicitrya*). Because of its habituation (*aucitī*) to [these five powers] the form that stems from the awakening of the vibrant objects that constitute [the universe][37] is beautiful with the five *brahma*- and [the five] *aṅga*[*mantras*], and therefore, on becoming the Śāstra, unfolds exactly fivefold. (169–171ab)

For when the Lord causes the endless flood of things that is inside [consciousness] to appear for the first time (*prāk*), he exists as the Īśāna-face. (171cd–172ab)

When the opening of the power of action that exists undivided inside has unfolded gradually, then only is this subtle (?*tāvān*[38]) vibration produced. (172cd–173ab)

A *distinct* vibration of the power of action will [in the course of creation] become *māyā*. For she will be described in [the passage on] the nature of the *māyātattvam* as "beneficent" (*śivā*) and "able to act" (*īśānī*). (173cd–174ab)

For Śambhu, whose body consists of the five *mantras*, and who is the [direct] agent in the creation of the universe consisting of pure, intermediate (*śuddhetara*) and impure, is in contact (*saṃgati*) with the impure (*aśuddham*) in the objects he wants to create; for everything is contained in the first moment. (174cd–175)

For instance when someone wishes to leave his house for a certain place, he [will] to some extent (*kiṃ cana*) [know?] in the first moment how far he has to go and what lies in between. (176)

37 Lit.: "from the awakening of the parts (*aṃśa*) that are the vibrant objects."
38 Lit.: "only so much".

tuṭipāte 'pi sarvajñasarvakartṛtvalabdhṛtā |
tata eva viśeṣāṃśaniṣkampakuśalātmanām ||177||
tathā hi jātyakhaḍgāgradhārāsaṃsparśasaṃmitā |
sphurattvasamakālaṃ dhīr viśeṣāṃśān prakarṣati ||178||
ratnatattvasphuṭaprajño vidyuttatkāladarśitān |
tāṃs tān viśeṣāṃś cinute ratnānāṃ bhūyasām api ||179||
anekasvarasaṃbhārasparśalāghavayojite |
vīṇāyām ekavistāre vaicitryaṃ vetti tanmayaḥ ||180||
nibiḍābhyāsadhārāgraviśrāntaśravaṇendriyaḥ |
vetty eva tatsvarāṃśāntaḥśrutyūnādhikatām api ||181||
āstām abhedavāde 'sminn ayatnenaiva siddhyati |
etad yatra vibhāte 'pi bhede vāstavam advayam ||182||
bhedaikajīvite śāstre yāvad etad sthitaṃ sphuṭam |
tathā hi pātañjalinā pāde vaibhūtanāmani ||183||
nyarūpyata 'prātibhād vā sarvam' atra mayāpi ca |
prātibhe prathamonmeṣe saṃvidrūpiṇy akhaṇḍite ||184||
sthitaḥ sarvasphurattātmā sarvasiddhiphalodayaḥ |
evaṃ jagati nirmeye nirmitsāsvīkṛtaṃ balāt ||185||
aśuddham api tadrūpanānāvaicitryayogy api |
sāmānyākārarūpeṇa dalaṃ bhedātmasundaram ||186||
āste pronmiṣitaṃ saiṣā bhedābhedātmikā sthitiḥ |
ata eva hi sādākhye jñānaśaktisvarūpiṇi ||187||
aśuddhileśakāluṣyāt parāparatayā sthitiḥ |

177b labdhṛtā: *labdhyatā* J_2. 178b saṃsparśa: *saṃspa<rśa>* J_1. 178c dhīr: *dhī* J_2. 179b darśitān: *darśitāt* J_2. 181c eva tat: *etat* J_1. 182b ayatnenaiva: *ayatnaiva* J_1. 183c pātañjalinā (*conj.*): *pātāṃjalinā* J_1, *patañjalinā* K_{ed} J_2. 184b sarvam atra: *sarvatra* J_2 (both mss. indicate a lacuna after *vā*). 185a sthitaḥ sarvasphu: *sthitā sa* [—] *sphu* J_1. 185a sphurattā: *sphuratā* K. 185b phalodayaḥ: *phalodayā* J_1. 186b vaicitrya: *vaibhitya* J_2. 186d dalaṃ: J_1 has *dalaṃ*, but a correction to *phalaṃ* in the margin. 187b ātmikā: *ātmakā* J_1. 187cd 188ab om J_2. 188a aśuddhi: *aśuddha* K_{ed}.

For this reason those who possess unswerving (*niṣkampa*) skill in [noting] minute details "attain, even in one moment, omniscience and universal power to act." (177)

For the mind [can be] compared to the touch by the cutting edge of an excellent sword. It draws out (?) minute details in the moment of their appearance. (178)

One who has well-developed knowledge about jewels,[39] discerns the various details of – even many – jewels, if they are seen for [not more] than the duration of a flash of lightning. (179)

An expert recognizes the variety in the [scale that makes up the figure] *ekavistāra* [played] on a Vīṇā, [even if] composed of a rapid articulation (*sparśalāghava*) of a great number of notes. (180)

One whose sense of hearing has reached the highest limit through rigorous training knows even the pitch of the sub-intervals (*śruti*) in the notes [i.e. that define the notes]. (181)

May this be enough! In this doctrine of non-duality this (*etad*) is established without effort: even where duality appears, the reality is non-dual. (182)

Even in a system which rests entirely on duality [like Yoga] this is clearly established. Patañjali, for instance, states in the chapter with the name "magic power" that "everything is also [known] by intuitive [knowledge]". And it is also [stated] by me in this work (*atra*) that in the first opening of intuition, which is consciousness [itself] and undivided, there is (*sthita*) an appearance (*udaya*) of the fruits of all perfections in the form of a vibrant emergence (*sphurattā*) of everything. (183–185a)

In this way an aspect (*dalam*) which is impure as well as equipped with a great variety that is identical with consciousness (*tadrūpa*) and is necessarily (*balāt*) included (*svīkṛtam*) [already] in the desire to create the world yet to be created [i.e. before it is actually created][40] remains expanded (*pronmiṣita*) [in consciousness] and beautified by its duality in a general form; this mode of existence is one of duality-cum-nonduality. (185cd–187ab)

For this reason, the mode of existence in the *sādākhya* [=*sadāśivatattva*], [as its[41]] nature is the power of knowledge, is the intermediate [higher-cum-lower] (*parāparā*), because it is stained by a slight trace of impurity. (187cd–188ab)

---

39 Lit.: "the nature of jewels".

40 Lit.: "The desire to create (*nirmitsā*) with regard to what is to be created (*nirmeye*)."

41 *hetau viśeṣaṇam.*

teneśabhuktād etasmād apy ūrdhvapadabhāginaḥ ||188||
māyāprakaṭanautsukyāt tatsaṃskārajuṣas tathā |
bahukriyāsamārambhamayaṃ vividhamantraṇam ||189||
prādurbhūtaṃ mahājñānasantateś ca śivapradam |
sa hi tatrāparo bhāvaḥ parabhāvanimīlitaḥ ||190||
na tu rūḍhim upāgacched aśuddhordhvavidhāv iva |
tena vaiṣṇavabauddhādiśāsanāntaraniṣṭhitāḥ ||191||
yathā samyaṅ na mucyante na tathā śaivasaṃskṛtāḥ |
atimārgakramakulatrikasrotontarādiṣu ||192||
parameśānaśāstre tu ye samyag dīkṣitā narāḥ |
teṣāṃ naivāpavargasya lābhe bhedo 'sti kaścana ||193||
na caitadatirikto 'pi mokṣopāyo 'sti kaścana |
kevalaṃ kvāpy anāyāsāj jīvanmuktikrameṇa ca ||194||
śīghram eva parā siddhir yathāsmaddarśaneṣv iti |
kvāpi tattvāvalīyogaparipāṭīkramāc cirāt ||195||
tais taiḥ kriyākalāpaiś ca labhyate paramaṃ phalam |
ata evāsti saṃhāradṛśām kauliky apīha dṛk ||196||
yathoktaṃ kālapādādau dīkṣayec chvapacān iti |
cidunmeṣādikāḥ pañca yāḥ pūrvaṃ prāgabhedataḥ ||197||
proktāḥ parasmiṃś cinnāthe bhairave samavāyataḥ |
tā eva bhāvopādhyaṃśalabdhabhedavibhāvitāḥ ||198||
bhedāṃśam eva puṣṇanti prāgabhedajuṣo 'py alam |
tathā hy odanasaṃbhogo yo dehasyopacāyakaḥ ||199||
kaphasaṃcayapātena sa dehasyāpacāyakaḥ |
nanu devasya viśvātmābhede 'pi svāparicyuteḥ ||200||
vikāriṣv eva yogyānām upādhīnāṃ gatiḥ kutaḥ |

188c teneśa: *taneśa* K_{ed} (misprint). 189a autsukyāt: *autsukyā* J_2. 189c prādurbhūtaṃ (*conj.*): *prādurbhūta* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 189d mantraṇam: *mantriṇam* J_1. 190c tatrāparo: *tannāparo* J_2 K. 190d bhāvanimīlitaḥ: *tathā nimīlanaḥ* K. 191a rūḍhim: *rūḍham* J_2. 191b aśuddhordhva: *aśuddherdhva* J_2, *aśuddhādhva* K_{ed}. 191d śāsanāntara: *śāsananottara* J_1. 192a samyaṅ: *mamyaṅ* J_2. 194c anāyāsāj (*conj.* SANDERSON): *anāyāsā* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 194d mukti: *muktiḥ* J_1. 195b darśaneṣv: *darśeneṣv* J_1. 196d apīha: *amīha* J_1. 197c unmeṣā: *unmīṣā* J_2. 198a parasmiṃś: *parasmiṃc* K_{ed} (misprint). 198c aṃśa: *eśa* J_2. 199c saṃbhogo: *saṃbhoge* J_2. 199d cāyakaḥ: *cāyaikaḥ* J_2. 200ab om J_2. 200c viśvātmābhede (*conj.*): *viśvātmabhede* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 201a vikāriṣv: *vikāreṣv* J_1.

And therefore (*tena*) a manifold deliberation (*mantraṇam*), which is full of the intention to act in many ways and is beneficent (*śivapradam*) because of the continuity of the great knowledge, arises from this desire to make *māyā* manifest. [This desire] experienced by the Lord (*īśabhuktāt*) is [still] part of the higher stage (*ūrdhvapada*) and bears its imprint (*saṃskāra*). (188cd–190ab)

For there the lower state disappears in the higher state, but one should not become established as if [one's] religious practise (*vidhi*) [were] beyond the impure [order of the universe]. (190cd–191ab)

For this reason those who are fixed in other doctrines [namely those taught by] Viṣṇu, Buddha etc. are not liberated completely. It is different with those who are initiated into the doctrine of Śiva. Now (*tu*) for those who are completely initiated into the Śāstra [taught by] the highest Śiva, into streams other than those of the *atimārga*, the Krama, the Kula, and Trika etc., there is no division whatsoever as soon as they attain final liberation. And [for them] there is no other way to liberation than this. (191cd–194ab)

Only sometimes (*kvāpi*) the highest perfection [comes about] quickly, without effort and through liberation in life as taught (*iti*) in our systems. (194cd–195ab)

Sometimes the highest fruit is reached after a long time through a gradual course of unification with a series of reality levels (*tattva*) and through many various rituals. (195cd–196ab)

Therefore the Kaula perspective is valid in this world (*iha*) even for those whose doctrine is dissolution [i.e. the adherents of the Siddhānta]. For it is said for instance in the Kālapāda that "one should initiate outcasts" [and thereby transcend the rules of purity]. (196cd–197ab)

The same five [powers, i.e.] "the opening of consciousness" etc., which have – because of their prior undividedness – been described above as [existing] in Bhairava, the highest Lord of consciousness, [these powers] are, because of their inherence [in Bhairava], clearly manifested (*vibhāvitāḥ*) through the division they have obtained by virtue of the aspect of limitation superimposed (*upādhi*) by the world, – although they are in complete (*alam*) possession (-*juṣo*) of their prior non-duality. (197cd–199ab)

For the same consumption of boiled rice that [usually] builds up the body, emaciates it when the mass of phlegm is reduced. (199cd–200ab)

[Opp:] But since God does not deviate from himself [i.e. does not undergo any change] even when world and self are undivided, how can limitations – which are appropriate only for things liable to change – have any scope [with regard to his powers]? (200cd–201ab)

tadupādhivaśād bhedo bhairave bhāvasaṃbhavāt ||201||
iti nāsmanmanobhūmāv upārodhum ivārhati |
tūṣṇīṃ vikāriṇo bhāvāḥ santīti hy atisāhasam ||202||
devaḥ sa eva viśvātmā tathārūpeṇa bhāsate |
anupādher abhinnasya bhinnam aupādhibhāsanam ||203||
nanv itthaṃ tad asatyaṃ syāt kathaṃ satyaṃ tad eva hi |
tathāvabhāsanād anyat kva kiṃ satyaṃ nirūpyatām ||204||
nanv evaṃ svapnasaṃsāraḥ kiṃ satyaṃ kiṃtv asau kila |
abhīṣṭārthakriyāvandhyo 'satyo vyavahṛtaḥ param ||205||
etac cāgre prapañcena yuktiyuktaṃ nirūpyate |
tasmād unmeṣaśaktir yā pūrvam āsīd abhedinī ||206||
bhāvonmeṣasvarūpāsau yātā tatpuruṣasthitim |
yad abhinnaṃ tad agrāhyaṃ yac ca grāhakam īśvaram ||207||
adhunā tat sthitaṃ grāhyaṃ bhedāt tadgrāhakaṃ bhidaḥ |
puruṣākhyaṃ tataḥ proktaṃ sṛṣṭeḥ prārambhayogataḥ ||208||
susphuṭapratyabhijñānān mukhyaṃ vaktraṃ ca bhaṇyate |
ata evātra visarabhāvasthitivighātakam ||209||
nānāruggrahasaṃghātaviṣādi paricarcyate |
anekayuktidalitavyādhisaṃśāntasusthitāḥ ||210||
atra susphuṭatāṃ yānti bhāvā bhedaikavṛttayaḥ |
bhāvatvam eva yat sarvaṃ tat tv idaṃ pūrvajaṃ mukham ||211||
sarvataś ca guṇotkarṣād īśānasyordhvavaktratā |
dikkālakalanāśūnye na tu digbhedakalpanāḥ ||212||
yo hi yasmād guṇotkṛṣṭa iti cordhvo bhaviṣyati |

201c tad: *tam* J_S. 201d bhairave bhāva: *bhairavībhāva* J_1. 202a bhūmāv: *bhūmām* K_{ed}, *bhūmāy* J_2. 202b ivā: *ihā* K_{ed}. 202d ati: *ata* J_2. 203d aupādhi: *nopādhi* K_{ed}. 206a cāgre: *cāgro* J_2. 206cd–209b For these verses we have fragment G. 207a bhāvonmeṣa: *bhāvomeṣa* K_{ed} (misprint). 207d ca grāhakaṃ: *cāgrāhakam* K_{ed} J_1. 208b bhedāt tadgrāhakaṃ: The syllables *-dāt tadgrā-* are illegible in G due to an ink blot. 208c tataḥ: *yataḥ* J_S K G. 208d sṛṭeḥ pr: these akṣaras are partly covered by the same ink blot as the previous line in G. 209a jñānān: *jñātān* J_1. 209b mukhyaṃ: *mukhaṃ* G. 210b paricarcyate: *paridarśyate* J_2. 210d śānta: *śānti* J_1, *śāta* J_2. 211d tat tv idaṃ: *tanedaṃ* J_1, *tattedam* K J_2. 212b vaktratā: *vaktragāḥ* J_2, *vaktragā* K J_1. 212d kalpanāḥ: *kalpanā* J_1.

[A:] We do not even have to consider[42] the idea (*iti*) that [only] because the world can exist in Bhairava, limitations through objects (*tad*) cause division. For it is brazen (*atisāhasam*) to say that changing objects [could] be silent [in Śiva]. (201cd–202)

[According to our doctrine] it is this God who is the self of the world [, because he] appears in this form. He, who is without limitations and undivided, causes[43] the manifestation of limitations as different [from him]. (203)

[Opp:] If this is so, then this [appearance of limitations] will be unreal; how can it be real [at the same time]?[44] [A:] Nowhere has anything else than the appearance [of God] in this form been described as real.[45] (204)

[Opp:] If it were so, why would the world of dreams be real [on one hand], but on the other hand (*param*) be said to be unreal, as it is considered (*kila*) incapable of producing a desired effect. [A:] This will be set forth with arguments and in detail later. (205–206ab)

Therefore the power of *unmeṣa* [=*cid*], which was not divided [from the other powers] before, attains the state of Tatpuruṣa by becoming the awakening[46] of the world. (206cd–207ab)

That which is undivided is imperceptible; that which perceives, [namely] the *īśvara*[*tattva*], exists now as perceptible, because of the division. Its perceiver is called *puruṣa* because of this division (*bhidaḥ*). And it is called primary face, because it is connected to the beginning of creation [and] because it is clearly recognizable. (207cd–209ab)

Therefore diverse ailments, seizure by planets (*graha*), violent death (*saṃghāta*), poison etc. are described here as an obstacle to the continuance of the state of expansion. (209cd–210ab)

Once their ailments have been destroyed by various means and they are settled (*saṃśānta*) and firmly (*su-*) established in existence, the objects become clearly perceptible as [entities] that exist only in division. The whole nature of existence is this first-born face. (210cd–211)

Because [his] qualities are superior in every respect, the upper face is that of Īśāna. For in him, who is free from the action (*kalanā*) of direction and time, no concepts of spatial divisions exist. And [as is taught in MVT 2.60] "he who has superior qualities than someone else" will be higher. (212–213ab)

42 Lit.: "it can not [or: does not deserve to] climb the plane of my mind [even] a little."
43 Lit.: "has".
44 Lit.: "how can the same [appearance] be real?"
45 Lit.: "What apart from appearance in this form has where been described as real?"
46 Lit.: "in the form of the awakening …".

tato bhāvān yadā samyag icchatīcchāvibhūtitaḥ ||213||
tadecchāyāṃ samārūḍhāḥ sā cecchā caiva nirmalā |
yena tanmayatāyogāt saṃvidaikyaṃ spṛśanty amī ||214||
kiṃtūpādhyuparaktecchāsaṃchādanatirohitāḥ |
te tadānīṃ sthitā bhāvā devas tu svaiṣaṇāsthitaḥ ||215||
parācīnitasaṃvittivaktro na ca parāṃ sthitim |
pūrṇām adhyuṣitas tena suṣupta iva bhāsate ||216||
asuptaś ca prabuddhatvāt tasya svāpo nimīlanam |
na hy asti paramārthena bhairavānandasaṃvidaḥ ||217||
tasmin paraprakāśe hi nimīlattvam upāgate |
pralayāt tannimīlattvamitir vā kutra bhāsatām ||218||
anābhātaṃ ca no vastu vyomasadmagavākṣavat |
so 'pi vā kalpitākāraś citprakāśe prakāśate ||219||
tad amīlita evāyaṃ nimīlann iva tiṣṭhati |
prabhūṇām avikalpyā hi śaktir durghaṭakāriṇām ||220||
idaṃ sukhena ghaṭate duḥkhena ghaṭate tv idaṃ |
ity ābhāsanavaicitrye svatantro hi sa eva naḥ ||221||
tad eva tasya svātantryaṃ śaktir niyatināmikā |
yayā ruddhaḥ paśur jātu svātantryaṃ naiva vindati ||222||
tadapekṣābalāt proktā patyau durghaṭakāritā |
na hi viśvātmanaḥ kiṃcit sughaṭaṃ vātha durghaṭam ||223||
kiṃ muhur muhur etenāsakṛn nanu nirūpitam |
hantāvismṛtiśīlaṃ tvāṃ praty etat syād apārthakam ||224||
ekam uddiśya kiṃtv etatsaṃrambho na virājate |
kiṃ hy ekāṅkurasampattyai prāvṛṣeṇyāḥ payomucaḥ ||225||

213c samyag: *sasyag* J_2. 214a samārūḍhāḥ: *samārūḍhā* J_{s}. 214b nirmalā: *nirmalāḥ* J_2. 214c Editor's note in K_{ed}: *nirmalecchāmayatāyogāt.* 214d amī: *amīḥ* J_2. 215d devas: *daves* J_2. 216a parācīnita: *parācīniti* K. 218b nimīlattvaṃ: *nimīlatvaṃ* J_{s}. 218c pralayāt: *pralayas* J_2, *pralayās* K. 218d mitir: *m iti* J_1, *m api* J_2. 221c bhāsana: *bhāmana* J_2. 222b niyati: *niyatir* J_1. Gloss in K: *niyatir nāma yasya sā.* 222d svātantryaṃ naiva: *svātantryeṇaiva* J_2 K. 223c na hi: *na na hi* (= *na* reapeated on next line) J_1. 224ab etenāsakṛn (*conj.*): *enenāsakṛn* J_1, *enena sakṛn* J_2, *etena sakṛn* K_{ed}. 225b saṃrambho: *sāṃrambho* J_1.

When therefore [God] through the power of his will truly wishes the objects, they become grounded in his will, yet the will [remains] unstained [by them].[47] For they are in contact (*spṛśanti*) with the unity of consciousness by being identical with it. (213cd–214)

The objects, however, are then hidden by the will that is affected by limitations as a cover. But God remains in his own will. (215)

This face [of God], which is consciousness, [but] is turned away [from the light], is not occupying the highest, replete state and therefore appears to be in deep sleep. (216)

And as he is awakened, he is [in fact] not sleeping. His sleep is the disappearance [of all things] (*nimīlanam*), for in reality there is no [sleep] for the consciousness that is the bliss of Bhairava. (217)

If there would be an [actual] disappearance of the highest light, then a knowledge of this disappearance would be impossible because of the dissolution. (218)

And something that does not appear, is not a reality (*vastu*), like a window in a castle in the air. Or this [window] would appear [as an] imagined form in the light of consciousness. (219)

Therefore he only appears to be sleeping, although not at all asleep, for the power of mighty ones who achieve difficult [goals] is incomprehensible. (220)

"This is easy to accomplish, that is difficult." – [Thus] he [alone] is completely free to bring about diversity of appearance for us. (221)

Thus his autonomy is the power that is called determinacy (*niyati*). It obstructs the soul so that it can never be autonomous. (222)

With regard to this it is said that the [ability] to perform difficult things lies within the Lord, since for him, who is the self of the world, there is nothing easy or difficult. (223)

[Opp:] Why this [statement] again and again. Surely you have explained it many times. (224ab)

[A:] Oh! For someone like you, who is not prone to forgetfulness, this may be unnecessary, but the effort [of teaching] this [doctrine] will not excel if directed to only one. Do autumnal clouds [rain] only for the sprouting of a single shoot? (224cd–225)

---

47 *ca* …*ca* = "though" …"yet". See Apte (1986), s.v.

marmasthānam idaṃ cātra vyutpādyo hi janaḥ sa ca |
vyāpto hṛdbhuvi karmaughakṛṣṭāyāṃ saukumāryataḥ ||226||
māyābījotthitānantavikalpāṅkurakandalaiḥ |
bhedābhimānajanitavācanaucityasevitaiḥ ||227||
yāvad vidyāmahādāvajvālayaiṣā punaḥ punaḥ |
nālabdhā tāvad asyaitad dvaitaṃ rohet punaḥ punaḥ ||228||
tīkṣṇayuktikuṭhāraughaiḥ sadvidyāvahnidīpitaiḥ |
nirbhinno bhedaviṭapī punar naiva prarohati ||229||
evaṃ deve suṣuptāṃśamadhyāsīne sthitā api |
asaddeśīyatāṃ yānti bhāvāḥ śvabhrakapitthavat ||230||
atra tādṛśam eva svaṃ jñānaṃ vairāgyanirbharam |
nirupākhyaṃ nirālambaṃ vyajṛmbhata vibhāgataḥ ||231||
kapālamālābharaṇāḥ śmaśānapadavāsinaḥ |
asmātparāṅmukhībhūtā bhūtasaṃghātagocarāḥ ||232||
bhogyaṃ jugupsāvadhi sarvam eva
bhoktā hy ahaṃ kaḥ kila deha eṣaḥ |
carmāsthimātraṃ na ca sāram atra
leśāṃśabhāge 'pi kadācid asti ||233||
ittham abhyasyamānās te parāṃ vairāgyasampadam |
pratikṣaṇam upāruhya nimīlanti tadāhatāḥ ||234||
kim etad iti dhāvanti duḥkhe 'pīndriyavṛttayaḥ |
etad evam iti prāyo virajyante sukhād api ||235||
dṛṣṭānuśravikārthaughavaitṛṣṇye vaśatādhiyaḥ |
tatparaṃ puruṣakhyāter guṇavaitṛṣṇyam ity api ||236||

226c vyāpto: *vyāpta* J_1, *vyāptā* J_2 K. 226c karmaugha: *kandaugha* J_2. 227b vikalpā: *vikalā* J_1. 227d two dots after *sevitaiḥ* J_1. 228a dāva: *dāha* J_1. 228b jvālayaiṣā: *jvālā yaiṣā* J_1, *jvālayemāḥ* K. 228c asyaitad: *āsyeta* $J_{1,2}$ K. 229a tīkṣṇa: *tīkṣṇā* J_2. 229a yukti: *yatna* K_{ed}, *yaṃti* J_2. 229b sadvidyā: *savidya* K. 229c bheda: *deha* K_{ed}, *deva* J_2 K. 230b āsīne (*conj.*): *āsīnāḥ* K_{ed} $J_{1,2}$. 231a eva: *evaṃ* K_{ed} J_2. 231b jñānaṃ: *jñana* J_1. 231d vyajṛmbhata: *vijṛmbhata* J_1. 231d vibhāgataḥ: *virāgataḥ* J_2 K_{ed}. 232d gocarāḥ (*conj.* TORELLA): gocarāt K_{ed} $J_{1,2}$. 234d tadāhatāḥ (*conj.*): *tadāhatam* K_{ed} $J_{1,2}$. 236a śravikā: *śravitā* J_1. 236b vaśatā: *veśitā* J_1. 236c puruṣakhyāter: *puruṣākhyāter* $J_{1,2}$.

This is a crucial point [of our system] and people should be made proficient in it. If their heart [i.e. consciousness] is ploughed like soil by the mass of *karma*, it becomes very soft and is therefore strewn with plantains (*kandala*), whose sprouts are the endless concepts stemming from the seed of *māyā*. [These plantains] are haunted by the habit of expression that is caused by the wrong notion of dividedness. (226–227)

As long as this [ground of consciousness] is not destroyed again and again by knowledge, like [soil is destroyed] by a massive forest conflagration, duality grows again and again for him. (228)

When duality is destroyed by sharp reasoning, just like a tree is cut by sharp axes, [a reasoning] which is tempered by real knowledge like the axes are tempered by fire, it does not grow again. (229)

Thus when God remains inside the aspect [of his nature] that is deep sleep, the objects, although existent, become virtually non-existent, like a *kapittha*-tree in the netherworld. (230)

Because of this separation (*vibhāgataḥ*) only such [an aspect] of his knowledge that is full of indifference [and] without designation or foundation unfolded [into the Śāstras] in this [western face of Śiva]. (231)

Those who live in burning grounds and wear garlands of human skulls for decoration and whose sphere is that of the assemblage of spirits are turned away from us. (232)

> Every enjoyment ends in disgust
> for the "I" experiences, the body is nothing[48]
> but skin and bones, never is there an essence in it,
> not even in the smallest part. (233)

By constant practice in this manner they attain to the highest perfection of detachment in every moment and close their eyes [i.e. die] annihilated through it [i.e. detachment]. (234)

"What is this", in this way the sense activities flow forth even in pain. "It is so", in this way they generally become detached even from the pleasant. (235)

And also [in the Yogasūtras]: "One, whose mind is in control when he is detached from all desires for the flood of seen [i.e. worldly] and heard [in scripture as a reward for following it] objects, [experiences] the detachment from the *guṇas* [only] afterwards through the knowledge of the soul." (236)

---

48 Lit.: "What is this body? Only skin ...". *kila* here perhaps indicates "dislike" or "contempt". Cf. APTE (1986), s.v.

nanv akāṇḍe 'pi pṛcchāmaḥ kiṃcid yadi na kupyate |
kim akāṇḍe bhedakāṇḍabhedakāṇḍaghaṭāvadhau ||237||
tarhi saṃvid iyaṃ śuddhā svabhāvād eva cet katham |
aśucibhyo 'pi bhogebhyo rasāt spṛhayatetarām ||238||
nanv avismṛtiśīlatvābhimānaḥ kvādhunā gataḥ |
alaṃ vā buddhyupālabdhair uktam apy etad ucyate ||239||
svabhāvād eva saṃvittiḥ prakāśaparamārthikā |
viśvāvabhāsayogena bhātīti hi vipañcitam ||240||
ataś ca saṃvido devyā viśvasmin bhāvamaṇḍale |
svātmany evocchalattvaṃ kiṃ khaṇḍanādāyi jāyate ||241||
yadāpi parameśānaśaktyā bhedo 'vabhāsyate |
tadāpi saṃvid bhāveṣu dhāvatīti vivicyate ||242||
yathā loṣṭahradajvālāśvāsakumbhaviyatsthitiḥ |
dharāmbudhimahātejaḥsamīrānantakhātmatām ||243||
yāty eva mitirūpeyaṃ saṃvit svocchalitā kramāt |
saṃvidrūpasajātīyān bhāvān evānudhāvati ||244||
nyarūpyata tathā caitat kenāpi parameśinā |
nimnaṃ taḍāgapānīyaṃ kaḥ pravartayituṃ kṣamaḥ ||245||
paripūrṇe punas tasmin pravāhāḥ sarvatomukhāḥ |
nanu kiṃ kāṃścid evetthaṃ saiṣā svaniyater balāt ||246||
itthaṃ dhāvati tac cāsyā rāgatattvātmakaṃ vapuḥ |
tatrāpi ca tathā rāgābhāsa eva sa dhāryatām ||247||
cidātmani tu rāgo 'stu ko 'py anyārūṣaṇātmakaḥ |
nanv itthaṃ cet kathaṃ nāma sā kutrāpi virajyate ||248||
hanta prakṛta evāyaṃ vādaḥ saṃgatim āgataḥ |
yadā hi citir evaiṣā sarvataḥ saṃkucatsthitiḥ ||249||
krameṇa bhogopāyebhyo bhogyebhyo dehato bhujaḥ |
bhogād bhoktus tathā śūnyā mahāpralayabhāg iva ||250||
jāyate rudrarūpaiṣā daśā sāṃhārikī yataḥ |

237c kim akāṇḍe: *kim akāṇḍa* K_{ed} J_2. 238d rasāt: *na sā* J_1 K, *nasān* J_2. 238d tarām: *tamām* J_2. 239b gataḥ: *kutaḥ* J_2. 239c alaṃ: *ayaṃ* J_{Σ}. 242b 'vabhāsyate: *'vabhāsite* J_1. 242c tadāpi: *tathāpi* J_{Σ}. 243a yathā: *yadā* J_2, *tathā* K? (ambiguous reference in the K_{ed}). 243a loṣṭa: *loṣṭha* K_{ed} (misprint). 243c dharā: *dhārā* J_2. 244a miti: *śiti* J_{Σ}, K. 244b svocchalitā kramāt (*conj.* ISAACSON): *svocchalitakramāt* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 244c sajātīyān: *majatīyān* J_2. 245a nyarūpyata: *nyarūpyate* J_1. 245c taḍāga: *taḍāka* J_{Σ}. 246a paripūrṇe: *paripūrṇa* J_1. 246c kāṃś: *kāṃ* J_1. 248a rāgo 'stu (*conj.*): *rāgas tu* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 248b ārūṣaṇā: *ārūpaṇā* J_1, *ābhūṣaṇā* J_2. 248d virajyate: *virājyate* J_1. 249b saṃgatim: *sa gatim* J_1. 249d sarvataḥ: *sarvathā* K_{ed}. 249d saṃkucat: *saṃkucit* J_2. 250a bhogo (*conj.* TORELLA): *bhogyo* K_{ed} J_2, *bhogyu* J_1. 250a upāyebhyo: *uprāyebhyo* J_2. 250b dehato bhujaḥ: *dehabhūbhujaḥ* J_1. 250c bhogād: *bhogān* J_2. 250c śūnyā (*conj.*): śūnya K_{ed} J_{Σ}.

[Opp:] We would like to ask something unexpectedly, if you permit: … [*237cd* unintelligible]. (237)

In this case, if it is true that this consciousness is pure by its very nature, then how is it possible that it has this extreme desire for impure enjoyments spontaneously (*rasāt*)? (238)

[A:] Where has your pride in not forgetting [what was taught before] gone now? Or [rather] enough of those [objections everyone's] intelligence must revile! Although I have taught it before, I shall teach again: (239)

By its very nature consciousness, which is ultimately light, shines as (*yogena*) the appearance of the world. This has been stated in great detail. (240)

How could therefore the fact that the goddess who is consciousness appears (*ucchalat*) in the whole sphere of the world only in her own self become a cause for division? (241)

It is described (*vivicyate*) [in this way] that every time the power of the Lord causes the manifestation of duality, consciousness flows into objects. (242)

Just as a lump of earth, a lake, a flame, breath and the space inside a pot become [respectively] earth [itself], the ocean, the great fire, air and endless space, [in the same way] consciousness as knowledge (*miti*), being projected from itself (*svocchalitā*), gradually follows the objects that are congruent to this form of consciousness. (243–244)

This has been explained by the indescribable Lord in the following way: "Who is able to cause water to flow out from a tank if [its level] is low? If [the tank] is, however, [over]full, streams [flow out] in all directions." (245–246ab)

[Opp:] But does consciousness (*sā*), through the force of its own determination (*niyati*), thus flow into certain [objects] only? [If it does so,] then its form is that of the *tattva* 'desire' (*rāga*). (246cd–247ab)

[A:] [I concede that] it may bear an appearance of *rāga* in this manner. There may be some kind of *rāga* in the conscious self, in the form of being coloured by another. (247cd–248ab)

[Opp:] If this is the case, then how could consciousness ever become detached from something? (248cd)

[A:] Ah, we have come back to the main topic of our discussion. For when the power of consciousness (*citi*) has become completely contracted, it gradually becomes emptied (*śūnyā*) of the means of experience, the objects of experience, the experiencing (*bhujaḥ*) body, from experience [itself] and (*tathā*) the subject of experience, as if entering the great dissolution [at the end of the universe], for the state of destruction which is [thus] produced is that of Rudra. (249–251ab)

sadyojātaś ca yad rudraḥ puruṣaś ceśvarātmakaḥ ||251||
śrīmān sadāśivo deva īśānaś ceti gīyate |
viṣṇur vāmaḥ kajy aghora iti caitad bhaviṣyati ||252||
antaḥsthasarvaśaktitvenaikaikasyāpi bṛṃhaṇāt |
brahmāṇy etāni kathyante bṛhattvād viśvabṛṃhaṇāt ||253||
tadanyaśaktyudrekāṃśe hy ata eva vivakṣite |
pratyekam asti brahmādihetupañcakayogitā ||254||
saiva śāstreṣu bhedena teṣu teṣu pratanyate
ataś ca sadyojāte 'smin mukhyā raudradaśā sthitā ||255||
sā ca saṃkocarūpāpi cidvikāse bhaviṣyati |
yallīnau brahmaviṣṇvaṃśau tenādhaḥkurute balāt ||256||
vastvabhāvamayītyādidaśā rudrādhidevatā |
bhinnaprameyeti śrīmadutpalena nyarūpyata ||257||
jāto 'pi bhedatanmātre saṃkocaṃ yad upāgataḥ |
tato vyatinimīlete bhoktṛbhogyāv iha sphuṭam ||258||
ajātam iva tad viśvam atra sadyo 'vabhāsate |
sadyojātapadaṃ tena śūnyasaṃvedanātmakam ||259||
tataḥ śūnyapadasyāntar yāvat sa ca vivikṣati |
devas tāvat svayaṃ bodhe viśvaṃ procchalati sthitam ||260||
jānāti seyaṃ nāthasya jñānaśaktir vikāsinī |
tayor vikāsiciddhāmni līnatvam upapāditam ||261||
saṃvidaḥ śūnyarūpāyā vikāso viśvam eva tat |
tathā hi ghanasauṣuptaviśrāntivaśanirbharaḥ ||262||
tāṃs tān gṛhāpaṇādyaṃśān vetti svapnapadābhidhān |
ata eva na sā sṛṣṭiḥ sthitir eva tu sā tathā ||263||
pūrvasṛṣṭeṣu bhāveṣu tad dhi vijñānamātrakam |
tathā ca jāgrato rūpāt svapno bhedena jāyate ||264||
kiṃtu jāgratpadādīnāṃ pratyekaṃ bahubhedatā |
nirṇeṣyate tato yuktaṃ sṛṣṭirūpeṇa bhāsanam ||265||

252c kajyaghora (*conj.*): *kajo 'ghora* K_{ed} J_{Σ} 253b naikaikasyāpi: *naikekasyāpi* J_1, *naikakasyāpi* J_2. 253c brahmāṇy: *brāhmaṇy* J_{Σ}. 254b ata: *eta* J_{Σ}. 254b vivakṣite: *vivakṣate* J_1, *vivakṣito* J_2. 255cd–257ab In fragment G. 256c līnau: *līnā* J_{Σ} G. 257b rudrādhi: *rudrādi* J_{Σ}. 257b devatā G: *daivata* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 257c J_{Σ} and K insert before *śrīmad*: *ādyaṃ ca nāṃtaḥ kiṃtu kadācitke bhrama ityādi tac.* 257d nyarūpyata: *nyarūpa* J_1. 258–259 In fragment G. 258a 'pi: om G (but illegible insertion.) 258a bheda: *bhedas* J_2 G. 258a mātre: *mātra* J_1. 258c tato: *yato* J_{Σ} G. 259a viśvam: *biṃbam* J_2. 260b sa ca: *sarvaṃ* J_2, *ca* J_1. 260b vivikṣati: *vivakṣati* J_1. 261a jānāti: *jānāmi* J_1. 261b śaktir: *śakti* J_1. 261c tayor: *tato* K. 263c ata: *atra* J_1. 263c sṛṣṭiḥ: *sṛṣṭi* J_1. 264d bhedena: *bhede 'pi* J_2. 265d rūpeṇa: *rūpaṇa* J_1.

For Sadyojāta is Rudra, Tatpuruṣa is Īśvara and the holy Sadāśiva is called Īśāna. Vāmadeva is Viṣṇu, and Aghora is Brahmā. This will be [taught later]. (251cd–252)

As they are internally of the nature of all the powers, they nourish each of them. Therefore they are called *brahman*, [and] because of their magnitude and their nourishing [of] the universe. (253)

When [Śiva] therefore wishes to express the aspect of predominance (*udrekāṃśa*) of one of these (*tadanya*) powers, each [power] is connected with [one of the] five causes, i.e. Brahmā etc. This [connection] is described in different scriptures in detail. (254–255ab)

And therefore the state of Rudra is dominant in this [face of] Sadyojāta. This state, although contraction by nature, will exist in the expansion of consciousness; [it is a state] in which the aspects of Brahmā and Viṣṇu are latent; he therefore (*tena*) subdues them forcefully. (255cd–256)

Rudra is the presiding deity of the state of absence of objects etc. The holy Utpala[deva] taught [this] with the words "[Brahmā and Viṣṇu reside in the flow of] differentiated objects of perception" etc. (257)

When he, although he is 'born' (*jāta*) into subtle duality, contracts, the subject and object of experience certainly disappear in him (*iha*). In this state the universe [then] suddenly (*sadyo-*) seems to be unborn (*ajāta*). Therefore the state of Sadyojāta is one in which emptiness is experienced. (258–259)

Therefore, when God wishes to enter into the state of void, he himself knows everything that exists, as soon as knowledge manifests (*bodhe ... procchalati*): that is the Lord's unfolding power of knowledge. (260–261ab)

The universe is [thus] dissolved into the light of consciousness that unfolds in these two (*tayor*) [the subject and object of experience]; this is (*tat*) the unfolding of the consciousness that is empty. (261cd–262ab)

For, to explain, one who is completely overcome[49] by the rest [experienced in] deep sleep, perceives different elements like for instance a house or a market, which are designated by the word "dream". (262cd–263ab)

Therefore this is not creation, but merely continuance in the same way (*tathā*). For it is only a knowledge of things created earlier [in the waking state]. And in this way the state of dream is produced from the form of the waking state by division. (263cd–264)

But it will be described later that each of the states of waking etc. has many subdivisions, and it is therefore appropriate [for them] to appear as creation. (265)

49 Lit.: "full of the influence".

ato nijavibodhena tān bhāvān vyāpnuvan vibhuḥ |
etais tyājayate tāṃ svām audāsīnyadaśāṃ vibhuḥ ||266||
jñānaśakter iyaṃ jṛmbhā tajjñānasthitibhāvinaḥ |
bhāvāḥ prayānti pūrṇatvaṃ vikāsinijatejasaḥ ||267||
paramaḥ khalu saṃkocaḥ sadyojātapade bhavet |
yad eṣāṃ svasvarūpasya niṣṭhā naiva sma jāyate ||268||
vinā saṃvidupārohaṃ sattāsattā jaḍo 'jaḍaḥ |
anīlaṃ nīlam ityādivyavasthā kalpatāṃ katham ||269||
yad uvācotpalagurur yathā sadasatāṃ tathā
jaḍājaḍānāṃ na svātmaviśeṣa iti niścitam ||270||
tasmād bodhabharollāsavisṛṣṭasvaparasthitim |
cidanuprāṇanāṃ viṣvag vamann ānandasundarām ||271||
cidekavapuṣā viśvaṃ svīcikīrṣaṃś cidātmani |
svabodhaśaktivamanāt sa devo vāma ucyate ||272||
svabodhaśaktyudrekeṇa yady apy eṣa prayacchati |
bhāvānāṃ svavapus tādṛk tathāpi paramārthataḥ ||273||
svīkartum icchan saṃhāram eṣāṃ kalpayate bhidaḥ |
ato bhedavyavasthāyāṃ vāmo 'sau parameśvaraḥ ||274||
atra saubhāgyaniḥṣyandi tādṛg jñānaṃ pratāyate |
saubhāgyaṃ socyate teṣāṃ bhinnānāṃ svīkriyaiva yā ||275||
bhāvānāṃ ca vicitrāṇāṃ bhogāṅgānāṃ svaśaktitaḥ |
svakautukakalālokād ucchalanty eva yā citiḥ ||276||
saiva svabhāvarāgeṇa viśvaṃ rañjayate yataḥ |
vyakto hi rañjayed viśvaṃ vyaktiś cāsya svarūpataḥ ||277||
yaiva procchalitāvasthā svīkārecchābharodayaḥ |
tadraśmisārasarvasve kṣaṇaṃ tiṣṭhaty ananyadhīḥ ||278||

266b vyāpnuvan: *vāpnuyan* J_1. 267a jñānaśakter iyaṃ: *jñāna … rayaṃ* J_1. 267b sthiti: *smṛti* J_1. 269b sattāsattā (*conj.* TORELLA): *satāsatā* J_1, *saṃdhāsaṃdhā* K_{ed} J_2. 270b yathā: *yadā* J_{Σ}. 270b sadasatāṃ: *sadasatā* J_{Σ}. 271–272 In fragment G. 271b sṛṣṭa: *mṛṣṭa* J_1. 271b sthitim: *sthitiḥ* K_{ed} J_1. 271c viṣvag (*conj.*): *viśvag* K_{ed} J_{Σ} G. 271d vamann: *vasann* J_2, *grasann* K. 273b eṣa: *oṣa* J_2. 274c bheda (J_{Σ} K): *bhedā* K_{ed}. 275a niḥṣyandi: nisyandi J_1. 275c socyate: śocyate J_1 K, śoṣyate J_2. 275d svīkriyaiva: svīkriyavai J_2. 275d–276a yā bhāvānāṃ ca: om J_{Σ} (lacuna marked with dots). 276d ucchalanty: ucchalaty J_2. 277c rañjayed: rajjayet K_{ed} (misprint).

Thereafter the pervading Lord fills the objects with his own knowledge and causes them to give up their state of indifference [by] pervading them [?]. (266)

This is the opening of the power of knowledge. The objects, which become the continuance of this knowledge, attain to fullness when their splendour unfolds. (267)

The highest degree of contraction certainly exists in the state of Sadyojāta, for [in it] the nature of those things never reaches steadiness. (268)

For how can there be any [limited] existence like being and non-being, material and immaterial [things], non-blue and blue etc. without rising into consciousness? (269)

For this is what the teacher Utpala said: it is proven that there is no difference between the natures of existent and non-existent as well as (*tathā*) between material and immaterial [things]. (270)

Therefore this God is called Vāma, because he emits his power of knowledge (*bodha*), [first] by emitting into all directions the animating consciousness[50] (*cidanuprāṇanām*) that is beautified by bliss and has created the state of own and other by the appearance of its mass of knowledge, [then] by the desire to appropriate everything into his conscious self through the nature of consciousness alone. (271–272)

But even when he, through the increase of his own power of knowledge, bestows his nature on the objects, he, although in reality wishing to appropriate them, brings about the destruction of their differentiation (*bhidaḥ*). Therefore this God is crooked (*vāma*) with respect to the continuance of division. (273–274)

In this [stream] the knowledge that is produced is accordingly (*tādṛg*)[51] one, from which beauty streams out. What we call beauty is [in fact] the appropriation of differentiated objects and manifold elements of experience through one's own power. For (*yataḥ*) the power of consciousness (*citi*), which appears through the light of the power (*kalā*) of its own desire, affects everything by its natural passion. For [through being] manifest he will affect everything and manifestation is due to his nature. (275–277)

If one's mind is devoted to nothing else, one remains for a moment in the utmost essence of the rays of this state of manifestation, [a state] which is the emergence of a massive desire to appropriate.[52] (278)

---

50 Lit.: "the animation of consciousness".

51 Lit.: "of such a nature [that]".

52 Lit.: "This manifested (*procchalita*) state (*avasthā*) is the emergence ..... in its (*tad*) utmost essence ..."

kiṃ nākarṣati kiṃ naiṣa ca bhāvayati yogavit |
tata evocyate śāstre nārakto rañjayed iti ||279||
kāmasthaṃ kāmamadhyasthaṃ kāmāṅkuśapuṭīkṛtam |
kāmena sādhayet kāmān kāmaṃ kāmeṣu yojayet ||280||
kāmaḥ svīkartum icchaiva tadācchādanayogataḥ |
viśvaṃ sādhayate kāmī kāmatattvam idaṃ yataḥ ||281||
tathā hi parame svātmany adhyāsya sthairyam añjasā |
taducchalitasaṃbodhakalāsaṃchādanakramāt ||282||
viśvaṃ kāmāṅkuśādhīnaṃ kiṃkaratvena bhāsate |
adhyātmasiddhayā yuktyā tv anayaiva nijodaye ||283||
prāṇaḥ puryaṣṭakaṃ dehaṃ vyāpya viśvaṃ prakarṣati |
tattvasya kāmatattvasya prakaṭīkriyayā yataḥ ||284||
siddhacakreṣv idaṃ gopyaṃ kiṃ vā na prakaṭīkṛtam |
śūnyānandāt prasṛtyaiva devaḥ procchalitātmakaḥ ||285||
vartamāno nijāḥ śaktīr vikāsyaiva pravartate |
yatrāsya praviviksāsti yataś ca prāvṛtad vibhuḥ ||286||
sarvāḥ śaktīr asau bhāvaḥ svātmany udrecya vartate |
tataś cidātmako devo nyagbhūta iva bhāsate ||287||
udbhūtās tu vibhānty etāḥ pronmeṣecchāvidikriyāḥ |
ataś catuṣkayukto 'sau yady api pratibhāsate ||288||
tathāpi śaktigaṇanā vastuto 'sya bhavet kutaḥ |
atraiva bhāvabhedāṃśanirmūlanakalā yataḥ ||289||
sthitas tataḥ samācāro lokātikrāntagocaraḥ |
anantaśaktivaicitryād atrāpy uccāṭanādayaḥ ||290||
saṃhāralīlābhūyiṣṭhā api tās tāḥ kriyāḥ sthitāḥ |

279b ca (*conj.*): *na* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 279d All sources, including K_{ed}, read a *tathā* after *iti* as if introducing the next verse as a quotation. 280b kṛtam: *vatam* J_1. 281a kāmaḥ: *kāma* J_1, *kāmaṃ* K_{ed}. 282b sthairyam: *sthaivam* J_2. 282d saṃchādana: *saṃchādanu* J_2. 283b kiṃkara: *kiṃvara* J_{Σ}. 283d anayaiva: *enayaiva* J_1. 284a prāṇaḥ (*conj.*): *prāṇa* J_{Σ} K_{ed}. 285d devaḥ J_1: *bodhaḥ* K_{ed}, *doṣaḥ* J_2 K. 286c praviviksā: *pravivitsā* J_{Σ} K. 287a sarvāḥ: *sarvā* J_1. 287a bhāvaḥ (*conj.*): *bhāvāstāḥ* J_1, *bhāstāḥ* J_2 K_{ed}. 287b udrecya: *udredhya* J_1, *udreśya* J_2. 287c devo: *deva* J_{Σ}. 288b vidi: *vidhi* J_{Σ} K. 288c yukto: *grantho* J_1. 289a tathāpi: *tathā hi* J_2. 290a sthitas: *sthitās* J_1.

What does he who knows [this] Yoga not attract, and what does he not create by imagination? Therefore it is taught in the Śāstra that one should be desirous to create desire in others. (279)

That which is in desire, in the centre of desire, or opened by the hook of desire, one shall obtain by desire. Willingly (*kāmam*) one shall unite desires with desires. (280)

Desire is the wish to appropriate. With [desire] as a cover the desirous attains everything, for this [world] is the reality of desire. (281)

For the world (*viśvam*), which is subject to the control[53] of desire, having suddenly acquired stability in the highest self, appears as a 'slave', as it is gradually covered by the power (*kalā*) of knowledge that appears from it [i.e. the self]. (282–283ab)

For (*yataḥ*) through this method, which is proved by individual [experience], the life force – as soon as it arises – pervades the subtle body and attracts everything through the manifestation of reality, [i.e.] the reality of desire. If anything is to be kept secret in the circles of Siddhas, it is this.[54] (283cd–285ab)

After emerging from the blissful emptiness God appears (*procchalitātmakaḥ*) as present (*vartamānaḥ*) and becomes active merely by unfolding his own powers. (285cd–286ab)

That in which he wishes to enter, from which the pervading Lord brought all powers into existence, is that state which increases in itself. Therefore God, who is consciousness, appears as if subordinated, but these [powers, i.e.] *unmeṣa*, volition (*icchā*), cognition (*vidi*) and action (*kriyā*) appear as active [and therefore dominating]. (286cd–288ab)

For this reason, though [Śiva] manifests himself as joined with [these] four powers [i.e. as Tumburu], how can one really count them. (288cd–289ab)

Since the power to uproot the aspect of division from existence lies in the [Aghora face], this practice [of religion] has its scope in super-mundane reality. Because of the diversity of endless powers, the various ritual acts [proper to this *srotas*], like the expulsion [of an enemy] etc., acts which are mainly [a form] of the playful destruction, persist even there. (289cd–291ab)

---

53 Lit. "goad" *aṅkuśa*.

54 Lit.: "what else is [there, which is] not [automatically] revealed [by that]."

tad ittham jñānaśaktyante bhāvānāṃ vapuṣi sthite ||291||
kriyāśaktir athāntyaiva tān saṃharati sādaram |
yathā sūkṣmatamā śaktir unmeṣākhyā parāvadhau ||292||
sraṣṭavyabhāvasthaulyena sthūlākāreva bhāsate |
tathaivaiṣā kriyāśaktir yasyāṃ bhāvā nimeṣitāḥ ||293||
svasvarūpasthitā kāpi pūrṇeva pravijṛmbhate |
nanv asty eva kriyā yasyāṃ bhedaḥ pratyavabhāsate ||294||
maivaṃ sarvā kriyā bhedaṃ praty uta prāg vyapohati |
tathā hi bhedabhūmau ye kāṣṭhajvalanataṇḍulāḥ ||295||
ta eva pākāviṣṭatve bhedaṃ projjhanti sādaram |
yadi bhinnasvarūpās te pākaikyaṃ tat kathaṃ bhavet ||296||
bhinnaṃ svarūpam aṅgānāṃ na hi yuktyopapadyate |
nanu pāko na kaścit sa yat tan nānāsvarūpakam ||297||
jvalanakledadāhādi tat pāka iti śabdyate |
bhinnā eva kriyāḥ sarvāḥ phalam ekaṃ prati sthitāḥ ||298||
pāka ity ucyate nānyā kriyā nāmāsti kācana |
etad eva kathaṃ bahvya ekaṃ phalam abhīpsitam ||299||
kathaṃ saṃpādayeyus tāḥ. pūrvoktād eva hetutaḥ |
nanu locanadīpārthamanaskārair api sphuṭam ||300||
janyate jñānam ekaṃ tat tathaivātra bhaviṣyati |
so 'yaṃ kardamasaṃmardamalinībhūtavigrahaḥ ||301||
marau marīcikāmbhobhiḥ snānecchur abhidhāvati |
bhinnasvarūpād yady ekam asti vastv iti saṃbhavaḥ ||302||
tarhi kāraṇabhedena na bhedaḥ pāramārthikaḥ |

291c ittham: *idam* J_1. 292c yathā (*conj.* SANDERSON): *yadā* K_{ed} J_2, *yayā* J_1. 292d parāvadhau (*conj.*): purāvadhau K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 293a sthaulyena: *sthālyena* J_1. 293d bhāvā: *bhāva* J_1. 293d nimeṣitāḥ: *nameṣatā* J_{Σ}, *nireṣitā* K. 294a sthitā (*conj.* TORELLA): sthitḥ K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 294b pūrṇeva (*conj.* TORELLA): pūrṇaiva K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 295a maivaṃ (*conj.* SANDERSON): *saivaṃ* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 296a āviṣṭatve: *āviṣṭatvo* J_2. 297a svarūpam aṅgānāṃ: *svarūpasaṅgānāṃ* J_2. 297c pāko (*conj.* GOODALL): *pāke* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 298d sthitāḥ: *ṣṭhitāḥ* J_1. 299c bahvya: *bāhya* K. 300b pūrvoktād (*conj.* SANDERSON): *pūrvoktā* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 300d manas: *ravas* K. 301c kardamasaṃmarda: *karmamasaṃmaṃda* J_2. 302a marau: *merau* J_1. 303b pāramārthikaḥ: *paramārthikaḥ* J_1.

Thus, when objects exist in this way in a form[55] that extends up to the end of the power of knowledge, the power of action, being the final end [of manifestation], then (*atha*) absorbs them carefully. (291cd–292ab)

Just like the subtlest power called *unmeṣa* appears in the highest state (*parāvadhau*) as if in a gross form due to the grossness of objects to be created, similarly (*tathaiva*) this extraordinary (*kāpi*) power of action, into which objects are resorbed, appears as established in its own nature as if replete. (292cd–294ab)

[Opp:] Is it not the case that there is action, in which difference appears? [A:] It is not so. On the contrary every action denies previous differentiation. (294cd–295ab)

For in the realm of difference [disparate objects like] firewood, fire and rice grains carefully give up their diversity, once they become part of the process of cooking. (295cd–296ab)

If they were different *by nature*, how could they become one in [the process of] cooking? For parts [of a process] cannot logically have different natures. (296cd–297ab)

[Opp:] But there is nothing [independent] that is 'cooking.' The various (*yat tat*) [actions] of different nature like lighting the flames, moisturing, heating etc. [together] are called cooking. (297cd–298ab)

[A:] All the different actions [involved in cooking] exist for the sake of this single purpose, which is called 'cooking'. There is no other action whatsoever [that is involved in the process and which is not covered by "cooking".] (298cd–299ab)

[Opp:] How is this possible? How should many [actions] produce [only] one desired result? [A:] For the same reason. (299cd–300ab)

[Opp:] But [the parts in the process of perception, i.e.] the faculty of sight, light, the object and the mental perception [also] produce only a single knowledge [without becoming one]; the same should be true in this case. (300cd–301ab)

[A:] You [behave like] someone, whose body is stained by contact with mud, and runs to the desert to wash himself with the waters of a mirage. (301cd–302ab)

If it is possible that a single reality [like perception] is caused by something which is divided, then the division in the cause does not entail an ultimately real duality. (302cd–303ab)

---

55 Lit.: "when there is a form of objects that extends".

atha bhinnasvarūpaṃ tad ekaṃ cety upagamyate ||303||
svabhāvabhedo bhedāyety etat tyaktaṃ vrataṃ bhavet
nanv itthaṃ sā kriyā mā bhūd ekā kāṣṭhādi kārakam ||304||
phalaṃ janayatām evam apy astu na hi naḥ kṣatiḥ |
kriyā hi nāma nāsmākam anyā śaktis tv asau yataḥ ||305||
śaktiś ca phalabhitkḷptyā bhāvātmaivāvibhedataḥ |
sā ca śaktir vibhor eva sa ca viśvātmavigrahaḥ ||306||
phalakārakabhedena na bhinnā paramārthataḥ |
svātmany abhinne 'pi vibhor evaṃ bhedāvabhāsanāt ||307||
kriyāśaktir iti proktā yayā kartā maheśvaraḥ |
nanu yat paśavaḥ kuryuḥ kathaṃ tad upapadyatām ||308||
te hi bhedaikajīvatvāt kuryur bhedavatīṃ kriyām |
alam etena paśavaḥ kathaṃ kuryur iti sphuṭam ||309||
sa eva svavacaśchinno vādo vandhyāsutādivat |
na hi kumbhakṛtaḥ kvāpi kadācit kartṛtā bhavet ||310||
yadi nāsau maheśākhyāt kartur avyatirekabhāk |
nanu kiṃ svit kulālena kumbho 'pi kriyate tataḥ ||311||
īśasya viśvakartṛtve kiṃ paṭe 'pi na kartṛtā |
yady evaṃ tat kulālena paṭo 'pi kriyate na kim ||312||
nanv evaṃ sati no kartā ko 'py anya iti karmaṇām |
śubhāśubhānāṃ svaphalaṃ kartuṃ kaṃ prati hetutā ||313||
evam evaitad āyuṣmaṃs tathāhy evaṃ vijānatām |
na kiṃ cana phalaṃ kvāpi śubhāśubhasamudbhavam ||314||
itthaṃ ye tu na jānanti bhuñjate te 'vipaścitaḥ |
tad eva karmasaṃjñaṃ tu malam ajñānamūlakam ||315||

304d kāṣṭhādi: *kaṣṭhādi* J_Σ. 305b kṣatiḥ: *kṣitiḥ* K_{ed}. 306a phalabhit: *phalabhṛt* J_Σ. 306b bhāvātmaivāvibhedataḥ (*conj.* TORELLA): *bhāvātmaiva vibhedataḥ* K_{ed} J_Σ. 306c śaktir: *śakti* J_1. 307b bhinnā (*conj.* TORELLA): bhinnaḥ K_{ed} J_Σ. 309d iti (*conj.*): *yadi* K_{ed} J_Σ. 310b sutādivat: *sutād iva* J_1. 312b paṭe: *paṭo* J_2. 311cd–312 The sequence in all sources is as follows: 312cd. 311cd. 312ab. 313c śubhāśubhānāṃ: *śubhānāṃ śubhānāṃ* J_1. 313d kartuṃ: *hetuṃ* J_Σ K. 313d kaṃ: *kiṃ* J_Σ. 313d hetutā: *hetutaḥ* J_Σ. 315b 'vipaścitaḥ: *vipaścitaḥ* J_Σ. 315c karma: *karmā* J_1, *kārma* K.

If (*atha*) it is accepted that one thing can have different natures, then the vow that a difference in nature leads to division should be given up. (303cd–304ab)

[Opp:] If this is so, action would not be one, [but] the causal factors, [i.e.] wood etc., would produce the effect. [A:] Even this might be the case. It does not undermine our position, for action is for us not different [from the causal factors], as it is power, and power becomes[56] an object by producing a differentiation (*bhid*) of effects without being [itself] divided (*avibhedataḥ*). And power belongs to the all-pervading God who has the universe as his body. (304cd–306)

In reality [power] is not divided by the division of causal factors and effects, because the all-pervading God, despite being undivided in himself, causes division to appear in this way. [The power] is taught to be the power of action, [a power] through which Maheśvara becomes an agent. (307–308ab)

[Opp:] But how can we account for that which bound souls would produce? For they, being completely dependent on division, can cause only differentiated action. (308cd–309ab)

[A:] Enough of that! Your argument [i.e. the enquiry into] 'how the souls would produce' is clearly (*sphuṭam*) self-contradictory, like, for instance, "the son of a barren woman." (309cd–310ab)

For nowhere and never is it possible for the potter [in the well-known example for creation] to become the agent [of the pot] unless he is indistinguishable from the [real] agent called Maheśa [i.e. Śiva]. (310cd–311ab)

[Opp:] But in what sense[57] is the pot made also by the potter? Given the fact that God is the universal agent, is he not the agent [in the production] of a cloth as well. If this is correct, would it not then be true that the cloth too is produced by the potter. (311cd–312)

If this is correct, there would be no other agent [than God]. As a consequence (*iti*), there would be no one for whom good and bad actions could be the cause for a [future] fruition.[58] (313)

[A:] You are right, Sir! For you should know that there is never any effect, which is produced by good or bad [actions]. (314)

But those who do not understand it in this way experience [the effects] without [ever] realizing this. For what is called *karma* is [actually] an impurity (*mala*), which has ignorance as its source. (315)

---

56 Lit.: "is of the nature of".

57 Lit.: "how" (*kiṃ svit*).

58 Lit.: "With regard to whom (*kaṃ prati*) would good and bad actions be the cause for the production (*kartuṃ*) of their fruit?"

etad evānumanyaiva kecit saṃvittimātrakam |
saṃmanyante hy akartāraṃ kartṛtvānupapattitaḥ ||316||
citsvarūpādhikaṃ hy asya yat tat kartṛtvam ucyate |
taj jāḍyam arpayed asmai cidādhikyaprasaṅgataḥ ||317||
prakṛteḥ kartṛtā puṃsi nanu nāmopacaryate |
etan nyāyapathāpetair vṛthā jegīyate gṛhe ||318||
upacāro hi no vastutathātvaṃ pratipadyate |
vyapadeśaḥ paraṃ tādṛg vastuśūnyo 'stu tāvatā ||319||
nopacārikavahnitvavyapadeśe 'pi mānavaḥ |
himānīśīkarāsārivātotthaśiśirāpahaḥ ||320||
draṣṭuḥ puṃsaś ca na draṣṭrī prakṛtiḥ parigīyate |
na cānyo 'sti varāko 'taḥ kartṛbhāvopacārakaḥ ||321||
kiṃ ca prayojanaṃ tasya kartṛtvavyavahārajam
vyapadeśas tu nāvastu parivartayituṃ kṣamaḥ ||322||
ye 'py ātmānaṃ nayavidaḥ kartāraṃ samupāgaman |
te 'pi praśnam imaṃ tāvad asmākaṃ pratibhārpitam ||323||
kiṃ yādṛglokasaṃsiddhakartṛtvaṃ karmayogataḥ |
spandātma tad vibhau spandahīne samupapadyate ||324||
nanu jñānaṃ cikīrṣā ca yatnaś ceti guṇatrayam |
samavaiti yad atrāsya tat kartṛtvam udāhṛtam ||325||
itthaṃ bālamatīnāṃ dhīr vipralabhyeta vañcakaiḥ |
dārakā api vā vidyur na saṃvedanavarjitāḥ ||326||
tatra jñānaṃ na kartṛtvaṃ sarvatrāsty eva tad yataḥ |
icchāyatnāv api prāyaḥ saṃstaḥ sarvasya sarvataḥ ||327||
kumbhakāro gṛhābhāvaparitāpitacetanaḥ |
jānann icchan sayatno 'pi kiṃ kuryān nātmano gṛham ||328||
nanu kartuṃ na jānāti tataḥ kartuṃ na cecchati |
tasmāt kartuṃ na yatate tad gṛhaṃ kurutāṃ kathaṃ ||329||

316a ānumanyaiva: *ānumatyaiva* J_2 K, *ābhimatyaiva* J_1. 316c akartāraṃ: *kartāraṃ* J_2. 317c jāḍyam: *jātyam* J_Σ K. 317c arpayed: *arṣayed* J_1. 319b tathātvaṃ: *tathātvāṃ* J_2. 321c varāko 'taḥ: *nare ke taiḥ* J_Σ K (*vare* in K). 323a ye: *yo* J_2. 323a nayavidaḥ (*conj.*): *nyāyavidaḥ* K_{ed} J_Σ. 323c imaṃ: *idaṃ* J_Σ. 325c sama: *mama* J_2. 325d kartṛtvam: *karmatvam* K_{ed}. 326c vidyur: *vidyun* J_1. 326d varjitāḥ (*conj.*): *varjitam* K_{ed} J_Σ. 327d saṃstaḥ: *saṃsthaḥ* K. 329c na: *ca* J_1, *hi* J_2 K.

Some accept this [but] maintain that something which is only consciousness cannot be an agent, because it is not proven that its nature is that of an agent. [They] say that the 'nature of the agent' is something that is more than [just] the nature of consciousness. (316–317ab)

Then, as a consequence of being more than [i.e. different from] consciousness, [the nature of the agent] should receive [the attribute] of being material. [Opp:] Is perhaps (*nāma*) the nature of an agent [that actually] pertains to *prakṛti* metaphorically used for the individual self? (317cd–318ab)

[A:] This [doctrine] which is obstinately asserted by those in [their] house[s] who have swerved from the path of logic, is nonsense, because a metaphorical [attribution of a quality] cannot become the reality of a thing; such a [metaphoric] representation is entirely (*paraṃ*) bare of the [denoted] reality. For this reason (*tāvatā*) a person cannot remove the coldness caused by the wind in a snow shower, even if it is metaphorically called fiery. (318cd–320)

And it is not taught that the *puruṣa* as a perceiver has a perceiving *prakṛti* [as his active counterpart]. There is no other [reality] below him (*varāko 'taḥ*) that could have the nature of an agent metaphorically. (321)

Furthermore the use of the [word *puruṣa*] stems from [the necessity] of talking about agent-ship. But a name is not capable to transform a non-existent thing [into something existent]. (322)

Even those philosophers, who hold the self to be the actor, [...]. (323)

[Opp:] Is the nature of the agent as it is known in the world due [only] to its action? [A:] Then (*tad*) it follows that [the nature of the agent], which is a form of activity, exists in an inactive pervading God. [Opp:] Is it the fact that (*yad*) the three qualities 'knowledge', 'desire to act' and 'effort' inhere in the self (*atra*) that is called 'nature of an agent.' (324–325)

[A:] In this way the intellect of ignorant persons is led astray by deceivers, nor will children, who are without self-reflection, understand it. (326)

In [your argument] knowledge is not the nature of the agent, because it exists everywhere, and also desire and effort [to act] coexist probably (*prāyaḥ*) everywhere for everyone. (327)

A potter who suffers in his thoughts from having no house – would he not build his own house, if he knew [how to do it], wished and tried it? (328)

[Opp:] But [being a potter] he does not know how to do it, and therefore does not wish to do it, and for this reason makes no effort. This is why he does not build a house.[59] (329)

59 Lit.: "How could he then make a house."

kartum ity eva yad rūpaṃ jñānādīnāṃ viśeṣaṇam |
karotes tatra ko 'rthaḥ syād yadi saspandatā kila ||330||
tadāsau spanditum vetti prepsatīti bhaved vacaḥ |
tac ca svātmagataṃ nāsya spanditaṃ vaibhavodbhavāt ||331||
anyad aspanditaṃ jñānaṃ śarvasyāpi na saṃbhavet |
jñānecchāyatnavattvaṃ ca karaṇaṃ tasya bhāṣitam ||332||
ātmanaḥ kartum ity asya tato 'rthapravivecane |
jānātīcchan prayatate jñātuṃ yatitum eṣitum ||333||
pratyekam iti yo 'rthaḥ sa kartuṃ vettīti śabditaḥ |
cikīrṣitṛtvaṃ caitat syān na kartṛtvaṃ punar bhavet ||334||
tathātve mānasaiḥ sāmyaṃ bhaved vākkāyakarmaṇām |
vākkāyakarmabhir vāsya kathaṃ kartṛtvam āpatet ||335||
mānasāny api karmāṇi kathaṃ tasyeti gīyatām |
tadguṇatrayasadbhāve manovākkāyasambhuvām ||336||
karmaṇāṃ saṃciter eṣa karmabhāgīti cen nanu |
upacāro 'yam evaṃ syāt sa cāvastv iti varṇitam ||337||
kiṃ cātmagamahattvādidravyāntaguṇasaṃnidhau |
tāni santīti kiṃ so 'pi kartṛtvāyatano bhavet ||338||
na cāstv ity upagantavyaṃ muktāv api hi tad bhavet |
anyātmaguṇasāṃnidhye samaś caiṣa vidhir yataḥ ||339||
ātmasv ataḥ pravarteran kṛtanāśākṛtāgamāḥ |
kiṃ ceśvareṇa sarvatra buddhimattāvyapekṣiṇi ||340||
saṃniveśādhike kārye nimittatvaṃ kṛtaṃ yadi |
svaiḥ svaiś ca samavāyānyakāraṇāṃśaiḥ prapūrite ||341||
kam aṃśaṃ kumbhakārādeḥ prātuṃ bhavatu hetutā |

330a rūpaṃ: *rūpe* J_1, *rūpa* J_2. 330d saspandatā: *sampandatāḥ* J_2. 331a vetti: *vetthi* J_2. 332b śarvasyāpi na (*conj.*): *sarvasyāpi ca* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 334c caitat: *caita<t>* J_1. 337a karmaṇāṃ: *karmaṇā* J_1. 337a saṃciter: *saṃcitir* K_{ed}. 338a mahat: *mamahat* J_1. 338d āyatano: *āyacano* J_1. 339a upagantavyaṃ: *upagantavye* J_1, *upagantavya* J_2 K. 339c anyātma: *atyātma* J_1. 340b nāśā: *nāśāḥ* J_{Σ}. 340d mattā: *sattā* J_2. 341b nimittatvaṃ: (*nimi* repeated after page break in J_2). 341c samavāyānya: *samavāyinyā* J_2. 341d āṃśaiḥ: *āśa* J_1, *āṃśe* J_2. 342a kārādeḥ: *kārāde* J_2. 342b prātum: *praituṃ* J_2 K, *prabhuṃ* J_1. 342b bhavatu hetutā: *bhavati hetunā* J_2.

[A:] [Then] the inflected verbal form (*rūpam*) 'to do' is [no more than] an attribute of knowing etc. What is then the sense of the word '*he* does'? If it meant "being equipped with subtle activity (*spanda*) [of knowledge]", the sentence should be: 'he knows and desires to be active'; but this activity (*spanditaṃ*) is not in one's individual self, because it originates from [God's omnipresent] might. (330–331)

And a different knowledge [namely one] without activity is impossible even for Śiva. Being equipped with knowledge, will and effort is taught to be the instrument for the self (*ātmanaḥ*). Therefore, when determining the sense of "doing", the sense of each of [the following statements:] "one knows, [one is] wishing, one makes an effort, knowing, to make an effort, to strive," is explained as "he knows to act". And this means "being one who wishes to act", but not [what we call] the nature of the agent. (332–334)

[Opp:] If it is as you say, there should be equality of verbal and bodily acts with mental [acts], how else could one become an agent through verbal and bodily acts. (335)

[A:] How is it possible to say that mental acts belong to him? One might argue (*cen nanu*) that since these three qualities really exist, there will be a collection of mental, verbal and bodily acts, and he should therefore be the possessor (*bhāgī*) of his *karma*. But this would amount to a metaphorical usage, which has been described as insubstantial. (336–337)

Furthermore, if it is said that they exist [only] when individual (*ātmaga*) qualities, starting from the nature of the intellect (*mahat*) and ending with substance, are present (*saṃnidhau* [*sati*]), would this [self] be the locus of the nature of the agent? (338)

And one has to accept that it is not so, for [otherwise] this would be true even in the state of liberation, because this rule would equally apply to the presence of qualities of another self. Therefore an appearance (*āgama*) of deeds which had not been done or which had already been destroyed (*kṛtanāśa*) would occur in every self. (339–340ab)

Furthermore, if the causation (*nimittatvaṃ*) of an act, which is characterized (*adhika*) by a combination [of causes], which is filled by its individual (*svaiḥ svaiḥ*) constituent causes, i.e. inherent and other, and which depends on [someone] possessed of understanding in every respect (*sarvatra*), is done by God, then which part can be caused by the potter etc?[60] (340cd–342ab)

60 Lit.: "Which part could the causation of the potter etc. give (*pra-dā*)."

na hi so 'sty aṃśaleśo 'pi sarvakartari yaṃ prati ||342||
na jñānecchāyatnam asti kartṛtvaṃ nānyad ity api |
tasmān nānyasya kartṛtvaṃ kadācid api saṃbhavet ||343||
īśvarād īśvarasyāpi svātantryaṃ kartṛtāṃ viduḥ |
tad itthaṃ parameśānāṃ bhede bhede 'pi vātmanām ||344||
prabhavanti na karmāṇi bandhanāya svabhāvataḥ |
tasmād idam amuṣmāt syāt karmaṇo vā śubhāśubham ||345||
tad aiśvaryam amuṣyaiva vihitaṃ parameśituḥ |
nirṇītam etad anyatra mayaiva vitataṃ yataḥ ||346||
tad alaṃ prakṛtaṃ brūmaḥ kriyāśaktir iyaṃ parā |
aghoratvena devasya tata eva prakīrtitā ||347||
dākṣiṇyam ata evāsyā bhāvānāṃ śivasaṃśraye
yato 'ñjasaiva mārgo 'yaṃ yā kriyā ca na sātmikā ||348||
nanu nātra sthitāḥ kecid bhāvā ye śivatāśritāḥ |
kartāraḥ satyam itthaṃ tu bodhyamāno 'vadhārayet ||349||
deśakālakriyākārakalpanāpathavarjitaḥ |
devadevas tathaivāsya śaktiḥ sā viśvarūpiṇī ||350||
tad viśvam api kālādikalaṅkāṅkakalojjhitam |
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · bhairavābhedavartinam ||351||
tatsvātantryāt svatantraṃ tat svātmani procchalat sthitam |
yato bhāti tato 'py astaśivāveśabahiṣkṛtam ||352||
ata eva parā seyaṃ dakṣiṇāghorarūpiṇī |
yad vakṣyate jantucakre śivadhāmaphalapradāḥ ||353||
parāḥ prakathitās tajjñair aghorāḥ śivaśaktayaḥ |
anyatrāpi kriyāśaktiḥ śivasya paśuvartinī ||354||
bandhayitrī svamārgasthā jñātā siddhyupapādinī |

342c leśo: *leśe* J_{Σ}. 342d kartari yaṃ: *katur iyaṃ* J_1. 343c tasmān: *kasmān* K. 344a īśvarasyāpi: *īśvarasyapi* K_{ed} (misprint). 344d bhede 'pi: *'bhede 'pi* K_{ed}. 345c syāt: *myāt* J_1. 345d vā śubhāśubham (J_1 K): *vāśubhaṃ śubham* K_{ed} J_2. 346a amuṣyaiva: *amuṣyaivā* J_1. 347b parā: *parāḥ* J_2. 348a dākṣiṇyam: *dākṣiṇyām* J_1. 348d ca: illegible in J_1. 348d tmi: *kri* J_1. 349b śivatāśritāḥ (*conj.*): *śivatāśritau* J_{Σ} K_{ed}. 349d bodhyamāno: *rodhyamāno* J_1. 351b kalaṅkāṅka: *kalanāṅka* J_1. 351b kalojjhitam: *kalojjhi<taṃ>taṃ* J_1. 351c missing in all sources. 352a svatantraṃ: *svatantratvaṃ* J_2. 352b procchalatsthitam: *procchalasthitim* J_2. 352d bahiṣkṛtam (*conj.*): *bahiṣkṛti* K_{ed}, *bahiṣkṛtī* J_{Σ} K.

For there exists not even a small part, in regard to which there is not knowledge, desire and effort in the universal agent [i.e. God], and it is also taught (*iti*) that the nature of the agent is nothing else than this. (342cd–343ab)

It is therefore not possible that anyone else becomes an agent except for God. It is the freedom of God that is known as the nature of the agent. (343cd–344ab)

So [things being] thus, actions are not capable of creating bondage by their very nature, even if there were a multitude of highest Gods or a multitude of selves. (344cd–345ab)

Therefore, [whether] this good or bad [result] is derived from him [God] or [indirectly] from *karma*, it is [still] the sovereign power exercised by God. (345cd–346ab)

As I have expounded this elsewhere in great detail, this [much] is enough; I shall now explain the main topic: the higher [i.e. divine] (*parā*) power of action is for this reason taught to belong to God in the form of Aghora. (346cd–347)

As (*yataḥ*) the kindness (/southernness) of this [power] is therefore in the auspicious (*śiva*) residence of objects, this line [of argumentation], namely that action does not belong to the self (*ātmikā*), is correct. (348)

[Opp:] But are there no objects [or: beings], which, by resorting to the nature of Śiva, become agents? [A:] True. But [this] you have to understand and regard in the following way. (349)

The God of gods [Śiva] is out of reach of the [dualistic] notions of space, time, action and form and so is his power, who is the nature of the universe. (350)

But this universe, which is free from [even] the smallest stain of activity from time etc. and exists undifferentiated from Bhairava, [...] (351)

As the universe (*tat*) appears independent because of Bhairava's autonomy (*tatsvātantryāt*), and as surging up in itself, it even appears outside (*bahiṣkṛtam*) through rejecting entry into Śiva. (352)

For this reason the "higher power" is favourable and not terrifying(/of the nature of the southern Aghora). For it will be taught [in the MVT that] "the higher powers [i.e. those belonging to the goddess Parā] are called 'not frightening' by those who know, because they grant the fruit of the light of Śiva among beings.[61] (353–354ab)

And also in another text: "Śiva's power of action binds the soul when residing in it, [but] when it is known [as] standing in it's own way, bestows perfection." (354cd–355ab)

61 *cakra* in this context is hardly more than a plural indicator.

akārādihakārāntaḥ prasaro yaḥ pragīyate ||355||
sa eva bindunilayād asvaratvam upāśritaḥ |
kriyāśaktivijṛmbheyaṃ samastavarṇamālikā ||356||
kroḍīkṛtāv aham iti parāmarśasvarūpiṇī |
tiṣṭhaty eva. tataḥ pūrṇaparāhaṃkārasasphuraḥ ||357||
anantādiviriñcāntapaśusaṃghātaghasmaraḥ |
nijodaradarīnītacarācarajagadvrajaḥ ||358||
svacaitanyavimarśāntar grastapudgalasaṃcayaḥ |
yāvad ullasitas, tāvat kriyāśaktisvarūpataḥ ||359||
asaṃvijñānaniḥsaṃkhyavaicitryacarcitasthiteḥ |
anantakāryaśāntyādisaumyaraudrabhidātmanaḥ ||360||
api svagrāsamāhātmyaprakaṭīkṛtasusthiteḥ |
aucityād vividhākārā api bhairavatejasaḥ ||361||
riktapūrṇobhayabhavapunarāvṛtticitritāḥ |
śāktasvarūpaviśvākhyasvāṃśagrāsaikalampaṭāḥ ||362||
lokakālacirārūḍhabhāvonmūlanabhāvitāḥ |
śaktayo nijavisphārād raśmipuñjaṃ nijaṃ nijaṃ ||363||
prasārayantyaḥ saṃkalpasatyabhāvasamāśrayāt |
svocitāny eva lokotthavāmācārabahiṣkṛteḥ ||364||
ghaṭayanty eva śāstrāṇi yātāni paripūrṇatām |
yādṛk prathamasaṃbhūto lokātikrāntigocare ||365||
samācāraḥ sa evātra grastabhedadaśo bhavet |
pūrṇeyaṃ parameśasya mahāsṛṣṭir iha sthitā ||366||
yasyāṃ saṃhārasṛṣṭyaṃśā viśve te madhyavartinaḥ |
sā cādyā sṛṣṭir ity eva naiva vaktuṃ bhavet kṣamam ||367||
adeśakāle tattve hi katham ādyādisaṃbhavaḥ |
jāgraddaśeyaṃ sā mukhyā pronmeṣapadabhāginī ||368||
brahmaiṣa nijaśaktyaṃśasaṃbodhakamalāsanaḥ |

356d samastavarṇa: *samastā varṇa* K_{ed} J_2, *samastārṇava* J_1. 357b parāmarśa: *viśvāmarśa* J_1. 357a kroḍīkṛtāv aham (*conj.*): kroḍīkāreṇāham K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 358a anantā: *ananta* [– –] J_1. 360b vaicitrya (*conj.*): *vaicitrī* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 360b carcita:*citrata* J_2. 360c ananta: *aneka* J_1. 361a grāsa: *grāma* J_{Σ}. 362a abhava (J_1): *abhāvā* K_{ed}, *abhavā* J_2 K. 363d puñjaṃ nijaṃ nijaṃ: *puñjanibhaṃ nibhaṃ* K. 364d lokottha: *lokokhyaṃ* J_1. 365c saṃbhūto (*conj.*): *saṃbhūte* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 365d lokāti: *lokārti* J_{Σ}. 366b grasta (*conj.*): *trasta* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 366b daśo (*conj.*): *daśe* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 367a aṃśā: *āṃśā* J_{Σ}. 367d vaktuṃ: *vaktraṃ* K. 367d kṣamam (*conj.*): *kṣamā* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 369a śaktyaṃśa: *śaṃ†aṃśa* J_1.

The emanation [of the letters of the Sanskrit alphabet], which is taught to start with *a* and end with *ha*, becomes indistinct by resting in the *bindu* [=*ṃ*]. This opening of the power of action, which has all letters as its garland, exists (*tiṣṭhati*) essentially as the articulation of the sound *a-ha-ṃ* ["I"] when embracing [the whole series]. (355cd–357c)

When (*yāvad*) [the emanation of sound] subsequently (*tataḥ*) appears (*ullasitaḥ*) as equipped with an appearance of the highest replete [consciousness of] "I", as devouring all souls from Ananta to Brahmā, as ingesting[62] the multitude of worlds [full of] moving and unmoving beings, and as devouring the group of individual souls in the awareness (*vimarśa*) of its own consciousness, then (*tāvat*) [the powers that are] the lustres of Bhairava appropriately (*aucityād*) become manifold due to the nature of the power of action that has become adorned (*carcita*) by a diversity which cannot be perceived [completely and is therefore] innumerable, [that has] differentiated itself (*-bhidātmanaḥ*) into mild and fierce [aspects] because of an endless number of [ritual] actions, like pacifying etc., and whose perfect presence (*susthiteḥ*) is displayed by the quantity of [the objects that form] her food. (357cd–361)

These powers [that are the lustres of Bhairava] are variegated by repeatedly becoming empty, full, or both empty and full; [they] are lusting only for devouring the part of themselves (*svāṃśa*) that is called the universe in its state as power (*śākta*), and pleased by (*-bhāvitāḥ*) the eradication of objects that have for a long time been fixed in mundane time. [All these powers] spread their respective mass of rays through their own throbbing (*visphāra*) [and] by excluding transcendence (*lokotthavāmācāra*) bring about the Śāstras appropriate to them, [Śāstras] that attain to fullness, because they are based on the real state of *saṃkalpa*. (362–365ab)

Such a religious practice which appeared first in the transcendent realm, will in this world [too] be in a state of non-duality.[63] (365cd–366ab)

Here [in our system] exists this great creation of Śiva which is replete and inside of which all other [cycles] of creation and resorption take place. (366cd–367ab)

It is not proper (*kṣamam*) to say that this is the *first* creation, for how could something be first etc. in a reality that is without space or time. (367cd–368ab)

This is the state of waking; it is the principal [state] which partakes of the power of consciousness (*unmeṣa* = *cicchakti*). It is Brahmā, whose lotus throne consists of the awakening of his own constituent powers. (368cd–369ab)

---

62 Lit.: "leading into the cavity of the belly".

63 Lit.: "will be one in whose state duality is devoured".

tā etāḥ sauśivād rūpāt prabhṛti brāhmam antataḥ ||369||
rūpaṃ kṛtvā vijṛmbhante saṃvinnāthasya śaktayaḥ |
etāvān eva devo 'yam iti yady api śakyate ||370||
na vaktum aprameyatvāc cidrūpasya maheśituḥ |
prabodhapañcadaśikāmadhye tādṛṅ mayā sphuṭam ||371||
uktaṃ mitaprakāśatvaṃ jaḍasya kila lakṣaṇam |
jaḍād vilakṣaṇo bodho yato na parimīyate ||372||
tathāpi svayam etādṛg devo mānavivarjitaḥ |
nijasvātantryayogena kṛtvātmānaṃ carācaram ||373||
īśatatpuruṣājātair udbhūtair udbubhūṣubhiḥ |
ekakaiḥ ṣaḍbhir, ekena trikeṇa, dvyātmakais tribhiḥ ||374||
jāyate śivabhedānāṃ daśānāṃ vividhā sthitiḥ |
ata eva vicitrābhyaḥ saṃvidbhyo miśratāvaśāt ||375||
citrāṇy atra śivākhye 'pi bhedajñānāni tenire |
yadā trayāṇāṃ vaktrāṇāṃ vāmadakṣiṇasaṃgatiḥ ||376||
tadā pratyekaśaktitvaṃ bhaviṣyadbhavadudbhavaiḥ |
ṣaṇṇāṃ tritve rudrabhedas tenāṣṭādaśadhā sthitaḥ ||377||
ekaikaṃ pañcavaktraṃ ca vaktraṃ yasmāt pragīyate |
daśāṣṭādaśabhinnasya tato bhedair asaṃkhyatā ||378||
pūrvoditayathāsvasvajñānakarmavicitritāḥ |
nirṇīyante yatas teṣu tena no punaruktatā ||379||
anyānya eva bodho hi samācāraḥ kriyākramaḥ |
tatra tatra tathā proktaḥ sarvas tu śivadhāmagaḥ ||380||
yathā jalakaṇāh sarve viśrāmyanti mahāmbudhau |
tathā jñānakriyāḥ sarvāḥ saṃvitsindhau maheśvare ||381||

369d brāhmam: *brāhmas* J_1. 370c etāvān: *etāvad* K. 371c daśikā: *daśakā* J_1. 372d yato: †*tato* J_1. 373b devo mānavi: *dṛgdevo māna* J_1. 374–375ab quoted in TĀV 1.18 (p. 37). 374c ekakaiḥ: *ekaikaiḥ* K. 374d trikeṇa: *trikena* K. *trikona* J_2. 374d dvyātmakais: *adhvātmikais* J_2 K. *adhyātmakais* J_1. 375a jāyate: *tad ittham* in TĀV 1.18. 375a śiva: *śaśi* J_2 K. 375b vividhā: *abhavat* in TĀV 1.18 with *ubhaya* as ka's reading. 375d miśratā: *miśritā* J_{Σ}. 376b bheda: *bhede* J_{Σ}. 376cd quoted in TĀV 1.18. 378ab ca vaktraṃ: om K. 378c bhinnasya: *bhedasya* TĀV 1.18. bhirnyasya J_2. 378d bhedair: *bhaidair* (misprint) K_{ed}. *bhedeṣv* TĀV 1.18. 379a yathāsva: *yathāsvaṃ* J_2. 379d no punaruktatā (*conj.*): *nāpunaruktatā* K_{ed} J_{Σ}. 381b viśrāmyanti: *viśamvanti* J_2. 381c sarvāḥ: *sarvā* J_1. 381d maheśvare: *maheśvari* J_2.

These same powers of the Lord of consciousness unfold by taking on the forms starting with Sadāśiva and ending with Brahmā. (369cd–370ab)

Even though it is impossible to say that this God has a certain extent, because he, being the great Lord whose form is consciousness [itself], is not perceivable, – as I have clearly stated in my *Prabodhapañcadaśikā*: "It is said (*kila*) that the characteristic of matter lies in the fact that its light is limited. Knowledge is different from matter, for it cannot be delimited" – nevertheless this God, who is free from the means of 'measurement' [i.e. knowledge], makes himself into [the world of] moving and immovable [beings] through his own autonomy. (370cd–373)

The manifold existence of the ten Śiva divisions [of the Śaiva Śāstra] comes into existence from Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta (*ajāta*) by taking them singly, [either] emerged or about to emerge,[64] as six, as one group of three, and as three pairs. (374–375ab)

It is therefore through the blending of various states of consciousness[65] [peculiar to specific faces] that cognitions of duality are created in this (*atra*) [division] called Śiva. (375cd–376ab)

When these three faces are combined with the left [Vāmadeva] and the right one [Aghora], then each of them has the potentiality to appear in future, to appear in present or to have appeared (?), and there are therefore three [states] in each of these six. The division of Rudra is therefore eighteen-fold. (376cd–377)

Since it is taught that each face itself consists of five faces, the tenfold and eighteen-fold division[66] are therefore innumerable through [further] divisions. (378)

As these [faces] have been described above as diverse through their own respective cognitions and actions, there is therefore no repetition in them. (379)

For in each of them (*tatra tatra*) a different (*anyānya*) knowledge [i.e. doctrine], prescribed religious conduct and ritual procedure is taught, but each of them leads to the light of Śiva. (380)

Just as every single drop of water [loses its individuality] in the ocean, likewise all cognitions and activities come to rest in Śiva, who is the ocean of consciousness. (381)

---

64 Lit.: "wishing to emerge".

65 Lit.: "From the various states of consciousness through blending ..."

66 Lit.: "that which is divided into ten and eighteen."

mitam api jalaṃ bhūmau sūryāṃśubhiḥ kila pīyate
tad api ca punar vṛṣṭidvāraiḥ prayāti mahārṇavam |
jagati nikhilaṃ jñānaṃ karma sphuṭaṃ kim api svayaṃ
kim api ca paraiḥ pāramparyāc chivārṇasi majjati ||382||
yac cānte dakṣiṇe hārdaṃ liṅgaṃ hṛt paramaṃ matam |
tad apy antaḥkṛtāśeṣasṛṣṭabhāvasunirbharam ||383||
bhedabhāvakamāyīyatejoṃśagrasanāc ca tat |
sarvasaṃhārakatvena kṛṣṇaṃ timirarūpadhṛt ||384||
vijñānaśāstre kathitam ata eva maheśinā |
līnaṃ mūrdhni viyat sarvam ityādi timiraṃ vibhoḥ ||385||
evam eva durniśāyāṃ kṛṣṇapakṣāgame ciram |
bhāvayed bhairavaṃ rūpaṃ bhāvayadbhir durābhidam ||386||
uktaṃ ca yatra svar duḥkhaṃ tamo vādvayasaṃvṛte |
nāvidyākarmasaṃbandhaḥ pāratantryādidarśanāt ||387||
tad atra timirākāre bhairavīye vapuṣy alam |
antarlīnatayā bhāti yāvad vaktracatuṣṭayam ||388||
udbubhūṣu tathodbhūtaṃ tirodhitsu tirohitam |
tato yugapad evaitadbhidā ṣoḍaśakātmakam ||389||
dakṣe vaisargike hārde svatantre ca śive viśat |
aṣṭāṣṭakātmakaṃ śāstraṃ yugapad bhairavābhidham ||390||

382c svayaṃ: *tvayaṃ* J_1. 383a–d quoted in TĀV ad 1.18 (p. 41). 383a dakṣiṇe: *dakṣiṇaṃ* TĀV 1.18. 383b liṅgaṃ hṛt: *liṅgahṛt* J_1. 383cd quoted in Śivopādhyāya's *Vijñānabhairavavivṛti* 85. 383d sṛṣṭa: *spaṣṭa* TĀV 1.18 (emended to *spṛṣṭa* in the edition of the TĀ) *Vijñānabhairavavivṛti* 85, *sṛṣṭi* J_2 K, *spaṣṭa*. 384a–d quoted in TĀV ad 1.18 (p.41) with lines inverted, in *Vijñānabhairavavivṛti* 85 and TĀV 1.3 in the sequence given here. 384b grasanāc ca tat: *grasanātmakam* TĀV 1.18. 384c saṃhārakatvena: *saṃhārakatvāc ca* TĀV 1.18. 385d ityādi timiraṃ: printed continuously in K_{ed}. 386a durniśāyāṃ: *durniśāyāḥ* J_1. 386b ciram: *śiram* J_1. 386d durābhidam: *surābhidam* J_2. 387a svar: *sur* J_2. 387b vā dvayasaṃvṛte: *nādvayasaṃvṛteḥ* J_Σ. 387c saṃbandhaḥ: *saṃbandha* J_Σ. 387d pāratantrya: *pānatantra* J_Σ. 388–390 quoted in TĀV 1.18 (p. 41). 388c antarlīnatayā bhāti: *tatrāntarlīnatāṃ yāti* TĀV 1.18. 389a udbubhūṣu: *udbubhūṣus* J_1. 389a tatho: *tayo* J_2. 389b tirodhitsu: *tirodhipra* J_Σ. 389c tato (J_Σ K): *itthaṃ* K_{ed} TĀV. 389d bhidā: *bheda* TĀV 1.18. 389d ātmakam: *ātmikam* J_2. 390a dakṣe: *dakṣai* J_2. 390b ca (K_{ed} J_2): *'tha* J_1 TĀV 1.18. 390c aṣṭāṣṭakātmakaṃ śāstraṃ (J_Σ K_{ed} and ms. *ga* in TĀV 1.18, p. 41): *aṣṭāṣṭakātma tacchāstraṃ* TĀV 1.18 (main text).

Even a small amount of water on the ground is invariably (*kila*) drunk up by the rays of the sun, and through rain flows again into the ocean. [In the same way] all knowledge and action in this world merges, either directly on its own, or gradually through other [stages], into the ocean of Śiva. (382)

That which is inside, in the southern [stream], is [Śiva's] symbol (*liṅga*) in the heart, which is called supreme heart. It is replete with all created things it has internalized. And because it devours the particles of light that belong to *māyā* and foster duality, it is, as it destroys everything, dark and has black colour. (383–384)

For this reason Śiva has described the darkness of the pervading Lord with these words in the *Vijñānaśāstra*: "All space which rests in the heart (*mūrdhni*) [one should contemplate as Bhairava]". (385)

"In the same way he may for a long time, in a dark night, when the dark half of the month approaches, contemplate the form of Bhairava which is difficult to pierce (?) by contemplators." (386)

And it is taught that in [this reality] in which there is [empty] space, suffering or darkness, there is – once it is filled with non-duality – no connection with ignorance or *karma*, if one sees that [these phenomena] depend on [opposites] etc. (387)

When (*yāvad*) thereafter (*tad*) the four faces[67] appear as completely dissolved in the form of Bhairava who appears as black, then [these four faces appear] simultaneously as divided into [four stages, namely] about to emerge, emerged, about to disappear, and disappeared, and thus becomes sixteen-fold. (388–389)

Entering into the [four forms of] Śiva, the southern (*dakṣa*), the emissive, the heart and the autonomous, this Śāstra is called Bhairava[śāstra] and becomes simultaneously sixty-fourfold. (390)

67 That is, the five minus Aghora.

itthaṃ tantraṃ rudraśivabhairavākhyaṃ sthitaṃ tridhā |
vastuto hi tridhaiveyaṃ jñānasattā vijṛmbhate ||391||
bhedena bhedābhedena pūrṇenābhedasandhinā |
tathā ca mukhyāḥ śāmbhavyas tisra icchādiśaktayaḥ ||392||
tatraiva tu prapañcena pañcaśaktyādiyojanam |
itthaṃ madhye vibhinnaṃ tat trikam eva paraṃ tathā ||393||
śāstram asmadgurugṛhe saṃpradāyakramāt sthitam |
ata eva hi naikaṭyād vāmadakṣiṇaśāstrayoḥ ||394||
dhārā prāntadharāprānte kaulikī pravijṛmbhate |
tato 'pi saṃhṛtāśeṣabhāvopādhisunirbharaḥ ||395||
bhairavaḥ paramārthodyadravabṛmhitavṛttikaḥ |
īśānavāmadakṣāsu tāsu śaktitrayaṃ kramāt |
aparādiparāprāntaṃ kroḍīkṛtyāvatiṣṭhate ||396||
tad vibhāvayati bhedavibhāgaṃ
tatsphuṭatvakṛd atho tam anantam |
saṃgrasiṣṇu parameśvararūpaṃ
vastutas triśira eva nirāhuḥ ||397||
ūrdhvavāmatadanyāni tantrāṇi ca kulāni ca |
rūḍhāny amuṣyāṃ dhārāyāṃ bhedasaṃkocahānaye ||398||
paraprakāśaviṣayas trikārthas traidham āsthitaḥ |
sa eṣa parameśena jñānacandrākhyayoditaḥ ||399||

391ab–392ab quoted in TĀV 1.18 (p. 45) and TĀV 1.230. 391a itthaṃ tantraṃ: *tantraṃ jajñe* TĀV 1.18. 391b sthitaṃ: *idaṃ* TĀV 1.18 (p. 45. 392b pūrṇenābhedasandhinā (J_3 K): *tathā cābhedasandhinā* K_{ed}, *tathaivābhedabhāginā* TĀV 1.18. 393cd–394ab quoted in TĀV 1.18 (p. 46). 393a tu: om J_1. 393d paraṃ: *tathā* K TĀV 1.18. 394c dharā: *dhārā* J_1. 395cd–396ef quoted in TĀV 1.18 (p. 46). 395d su: *ṣu* TĀV 1.18 (variant of ms. *kha*), *sva* J_2. 396b udyadrava: *udyaddava* TĀV 1.18 (misprint?), *udyaddhruva* TĀV 1.18 (variant of ms. *kha*). 396b vṛttikaḥ: *śaktikaḥ* K TĀV 1.18. 396e aparādiparāprāntaṃ (TĀV 1.18): *aparādiparākrāntaṃ* Ms. *ka* in TĀV 1.18, *parādiśaktitritayaṃ* K_{ed} J_{3^*}. 396f kroḍīkṛtyāvatiṣṭhate: *kroḍīkṛtya trikaṃ sthitaḥ* TĀV 1.18. 397a vibhāvayati: *vibhāvayatu* J_2, *vibhāvayitu* J_1. 397b atho taṃ: *athoktam* J_1, *athotthaṃm* J_2. 397c saṃgrasiṣṇu: *sadgrasiṣṇu* J_2. 398ab quoted in TĀV 1.18 (p. 46). 398c amuṣyāṃ: *amuṣyā* J_1, *amuṣya* K_{ed}. 399a viṣayas: *vapuṣas* J_1.

Thus a threefold Tantra exists which is called Rudra, Śiva and Bhairava. For in fact the reality of knowledge unfolds threefold, through duality, duality-cum-nonduality and full union with non-duality. And thus the main powers of Śiva are three, [namely] volition[, cognition] and [action]. (391–392)

But among [these powers] a conjunction with five powers etc. [takes place] by extension (*prapañcena*). Being internally variegated (*vibhinnaṃ*) in this way this trinity (*trikaṃ*) [of powers] is the supreme [, and] such a Śāstra resides in the house of my Guru in an unbroken tradition. (393–394ab)

Therefore, because of its proximity to the Śāstras of the Vāma and Dakṣiṇa, the stream on the highest limit (*prāntadharā*) unfolds as the Kaula. (394cd–395ab)

Thereafter, as Bhairava is completely filled with the limitations of the objects he has resorbed and is nourished by the sound that emerges from the highest reality, he embraces the three powers Aparā, Parāparā and Parā in the [three streams] Īśāna, Vāmadeva and Aghora respectively. (395cd–396)

> So he unfolds the division of duality,
> he is the one who makes it manifest,
> then wishes to devour this endless manifested form of Śiva.
> In reality he is taught to be only three-headed. (397)

The Tantras of the upper [i.e. the Siddhānta-Tantras], of the left (*vāma*) and the right [stream], as well as the Kulas are centred in this [highest] stream so that they loose the contraction through duality. (398)

Having become threefold, this doctrine of the Trika (*trikārtha*), which deals with the highest light, is taught by Śiva [in MVT 1.1] with the word "moon of knowledge". (399)

Part 3

Commentary

Section 1
Introductory Verses 1–13

verse 1

Prefixed to the introductory part of the work is a verse that appears in the same position in other works of Abhinavagupta, like *Tantrāloka*, *Tantrasāra* and *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*.[1] In the *Tantrālokaviveka* Jayaratha provides us with an elaborate explanation of this verse. In the first level of interpretation he gives a Kula/Krama interpretation: the "five faces" are, for instance, interpreted as the standard set of powers, namely 'consciousness, bliss, volition, cognition and action'[2] as well as the five streams (*pañcavāha*) of the Krama.[3] The main point of the verse is its second level of meaning, which contains an allusion to Abhinavagupta's parents Vimalā and Narasiṃhagupta (*pañcamukha = siṃha*) and to his being born from a union of the two.[4]

The next seven verses are devoted to the author's *gurus*, that is his teachers in philosophy and religion, and his father. Verses *9* and *10* would probably be termed 'proclamation of one's own capability and authority for writing the work' by a traditional commentator.[5] Then the repeated request of two pupils is given as the immediate cause for writing the work and the form of the work is justified.

At the end of the introduction we find another benedictory stanza that foreshadows the main idea of the first verse of the Tantra to be expounded and here

---

1 The concluding verse 4 of the *Gītārthasaṃgraha* which is identical with concluding verse 5 of the *Parātrīśikālaghuvṛtti* (*abhinavarūpā śaktis tadgupto yo maheśvaro devaḥ* | *tadubhayayāmalarūpam abhinavaguptaṃ śivaṃ vande* ||), might be considered as an earlier version.

2 *pañcabhiḥ cidānandecchājñānakriyātmabhiḥ mukhaiḥ*. TĀV 1.1 (p. 7).

3 *pañcānāṃ vāmeśyādivāhaśaktināṃ mukhaiḥ*, TĀV 1.1 (p. 11). See below, *46–47*.

4 I may be brief here, as an extensive commentary on this verse will appear in SANDERSON (1996). For the *nirvacana* of Bhairava to which the *bharita* alludes, see SANDERSON (1995), p. 62–63.

5 *sāmarthya* and *adhikāra*. See Jayaratha's introduction to TĀ 1.15–16, where verse 15 is the 'commitment' to write a certain work (*pratijñā*) and 16 the announcement by the author of his ability to do so.

again a polysemic reference to the author's name is made. This pronounced tendency of Abhinavagupta not to hide in anonymity – most evident in the biographical passage in TĀ 37 – is helpful to the historian and unusual for an Indian author.

In the *Vārttika* the insertion of the word *abhinavagupta* in both benedictory stanzas (*1* and *13*) might be no more than the known practice to "mark" or "stamp" (*aṅkayati*) a work with the author's name – a poetical signature that would be more safely transmitted with the text than a colophon.[6] The sheer quantity of self-references in his works might be seen by some as an expression of a remarkable historical consciousness of the Kashmirian intelligentsia, evident in works like the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, but this is not the whole truth.[7] In the case of Abhinavagupta we have to take into account the religious self-consciousness that expresses itself in statements like the following: "For this reason, whoever studies this Śāstra composed by us, in order to gain an intuitive knowledge of consciousness, becomes a teacher. This is no boasting, but the truth."[8] And elsewhere: "An intelligent person who always studies these thirty-seven chapters [that make up the Tantrāloka] becomes Bhairava incarnate."[9]

The doctrinal point behind the rhetoric of one's own self being Śiva is obvious in a non-dualistic system and can be found already in the work of Abhinavagupta's predecessor in the Pratyabhijñā school, Somānanda.[10] Seen in the light of the notion that Śiva has to act through the *guru* in Tantric initiation, their identification is – for dualists and non-dualists alike – also part of religious practice: the teacher grants liberation by being the medium for Śiva's power of grace, be it through the unification of the soul of the disciple with Śiva in the

---

6 TĀ 4.278 and 37.85, being at the end of chapters, could be interpreted in this line. Kayyaṭa on *Devīśataka* 101 (ed. Kāvyamālā 9) uses the word *aṅkaśloka*.

7 The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* for instance is as much a historical work as a Kāvya. See K"LVER's discussion of Kalhaṇa's introductory verses. KÖLVER (1971), p. 113f.

8 Literally: "For true things do not deceive". *tataḥ prātibhasaṃvittyai śāstram asmatkṛtaṃ tv idam | yo 'bhyasyet sa gurur naiva vastvarthā hi viḍaṃbakāḥ* || TĀ 13.160. The commentator Jayaratha introduces this passage with a question that suggests itself in a culture, where the author's anonymity is highly respected: "Is it not a great deception [perhaps: 'ridiculous'] to praise one's own work in this way? In reply to this he says: 'For true things do not deceive'". *nanu mahatīyaṃ viḍambanā yat svayam eva svakṛtiṃ praty evaṃ praśaṃsā nāma ity āśaṅkyoktaṃ naiva vastvarthā hi viḍambakā iti*

9 *iti saptādhikām enāṃ triṃśataṃ yaḥ sadā budhaḥ | āhnikānāṃ samabhyasyet sa sākṣād bhairavo bhavet* || TĀ 1.284cd–285ab. The number thirty-seven plays on the number of *tattvas*, see commentary on *99*.

10 See Utpaladeva's explanation of *Śivadṛṣṭi* 1.1 in his commentary: "We, whose self is Śiva, bow down to the highest Lord." *vayaṃ śivātmānaḥ parameśvarāya namaskaravāmety arthaḥ* |.

process of initiation, or – in the systems where liberation in life is the main aim – through a direct enlightening influence.[11] From this perspective the identification of the *guru* with Śiva is an integral part of the religious structure, but mainly on the part of the disciple;[12] a teacher hinting at his identity with Śiva without veiling his personal identity and thereby filling the role of the *guru* is always on the border of overstepping the rules of decency in writing and betrays a strong self-consciousness. We can discern a different attitude in Abhinava's teacher's teacher, Utpaladeva, who starts his *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikās* by speaking modestly of himself as being a servant of Śiva. In his *Vimarśinī* thereon Abhinava, however, invests the passage with a different flavour: "With the words 'the state of being his servant' he expresses that a great fruit[13] accrues from this exposition of the recognition of god. A servant is [etymologically] one to whom everything is given by his master as he likes. This state [of being a servant] means that [Utpala] is a worthy recipient of the autonomy that is the highest Lord."[14] That Utpaladeva was actually trying to be modest while declaring his ability to compose this work is clear from his own *vṛtti* on the verse, where he speaks of being "ashamed of [his] solitary success" (*ekākisaṃpadā lajjamānaḥ*).[15]

verses 2–4

The three verses are devoted to Śaṃbhunātha, the author's teacher in the Trika.[16] At least in the works that deal with this system, i.e. all commentaries on the MVT, he is the teacher par excellence (see *394ab*) and simply called "my teacher".

In a fashion typical of the *dhvani* school the comparisons and identifications envisaged in the verse are only outlined and the reader is supposed to fill in the missing parts, as for instance the identification of the teacher's knowledge

---

11 See for instance the role of the *guru* in *anupāya* and *śāṃbhavopāya*, and *Śivasūtravimarśinī* on 2.6 (*gurur upāyaḥ*).

12 Compare *Svacchandatantroddyota* 1.45ab (vol. 1, p. 40), where Kṣemarāja calls his teacher the "manifestation of the highest Bhairava" (*parabhairavasphāra*).

13 The phrase echoes *mahāphalatvaṃ taddāsyam*, which is probably from Utpaladeva's lost *Ṭīkā*. Cf. IPV vol. 1, p. 21.

14 *tasya dāsyam ity anena tatpratyabhijñopapādanasya mahāphalatvam āsūtrayati* | *dīyate asmai svaminā sarvaṃ yathābhilaṣitam iti dāsaḥ, tasya bhāva ity anena parameśvararūpa-svātantryapātratā uktā* ĪPVV vol. 1, p. 14.

15 Cf. TORELLA (1994a), p. 1 and 85. The same phrase is adopted by the commentator Padmapāda on the first verse of the *Prapañcasāra* and applied to the Śaṅkara, who is supposed to have written this work.

16 For Abhinavagupta's gurus, cf. SANDERSON (1996).

with the sun (*bodhāditya*). This can only be known from the fact that 'lotus' (*ambhoja*) and not the night-blossoming water-lily is used here. A reference to the moon is saved for a later occasion (cf. *7*).

The clues that lead one to the next comparison are even less clear. Although it would make perfect sense to translate *arthaughāḥ* as "multitudes of doctrines", the use of the words "current" and "stream" points to a comparison of the entirety of knowledge with an ocean,[17] and the ability of these currents to lead to liberation is compared to the cooling effect the water has on the "heat" of *saṃsāra*. The doctrines are "radiating in" these streams, evoking the poetical convention of jewels in oceans or rivers, which produce their glittering. A similar image is used in the ĪPV.[18]

As we will see, the division of the Śaiva revelation into five streams and the position of the Trika on its top is the main theme of the first "chapter"[19] of the *Vārttika* which is translated here and it is not unlikely that Abhinavagupta wishes to allude to this thesis in the opening verses, especially in connection with his teacher Śaṃbhunātha, who seems to be the source for this peculiar interpretation of *ṣaḍardha*. The translation of the compound in *3a*, which rests on this assumption is, however, tentative and I am well aware that it might be an overinterpretation; for *ṣaḍ* has to be read twice (*kākākṣigolakanyāyena*) and a slightly awkward compound be endured. But as will be explained in *164cd–165*, the word 'half of six' for Trika is used to encapsulate a doctrine, according to which the three parts that constitute the Trika are formed by the "first half" of six streams: the five known to the Siddhānta and the uppermost stream, the one 'above the higher' (*ūrdhvordhva*). Although the expression "first half" is difficult to interpret, it is clear that the highest (*ūrdhvordhva*), the left (*vāma*) and the right stream (*dakṣiṇa*) are meant. For the adherents of this trinity it thus encompasses in some sense the whole Śaiva revelation and could therefore be described as its culmination, its "aim" (*artha*). The word *abhimarśa* is, however, very unspecific; in my explanation it would have to represent the sixth stream. The translation is of course problematic, but I think it is very unlikely that the author would mention the five streams in connection with his teacher

17 Cf. *381d* and *śivajñānamahodadhau* in *Nityādisaṃgraha*, folio 3^{v}, line 8.

18 Introductory verse to the Āgamādhikāra:
yaṃ prāpya sarvāgamasindhusaṅghaḥ
pūrṇatvam abhyeti kṛtārthatāṃ ca
taṃ naumy ahaṃ śāṃbhavatattvacintā-
ratnaughasāraṃ paramāgamābdhim ||

19 With "chapter" I wish to indicate the first unit of the text (*15–399*), which deals with the *pañcasrotas*, and not the first Kāṇḍa.

Śambhunātha, who is later quoted as the authority for this peculiar interpretation of *ṣaḍardha*, without hinting at the main thesis. I am aware of the fact that *trikārtha* often means no more than "Trika doctrine", but the straightforward rendering, e.g. "in the Trika with its awareness and the five streams", cannot work, because the Trika is not on the same level as the five *srotas*, but is conceived as their essence.

Sumati, Śambhunātha's teacher, is the first *guru* of the Trika known to later authors and this *paramparā* is referred to as 'disciples of Sumati' (TĀ 1.213).[20]

verse 5

Prof. SANDERSON pointed out to me that *yuktaḥ* is most likely used here in the sense of *abhiyuktaḥ*. The reading *janakaṃ* for *yuktaṃ śrī-* is rejected as the *lectio facilior*. I have kept the spelling *cukhala* as transmitted in all manuscripts of the *Vārttika* as against *cukhula* (see below), because I cannot see any criterion that would establish the correct form.

Commenting on a similar introductory verse in the TĀ, Jayaratha gives a more formal explanation for the fact that Abhinavagupta not only included his father in the list of *gurus*, but placed him in the highest position: "It is said [in *Manusmṛti* 2.145ab] that "a master (*ācārya*) is ten times more [venerable] than a teacher, the father a hundred times more than the teacher [...]' ..."[21]

Pādas c and d could be interpreted in several ways; firstly the forming influence (*saṃskāra*) of his father, who was withdrawn from the world, perhaps after the death of his wife, could have created the resolve in Abhinava not to marry, and therefore "remain free from attachment". Secondly, the intellectual educa-

20 Commenting on TĀ 1.213 Jayaratha insists that "those who know the order of this descent [of gurus]" place Somadeva between Sumati and Śaṃbhunātha (*śrīsumatināthasya śrīsomadevaḥ śiṣyaḥ, tasya śrīśaṃbhunāthaḥ iti hi āyātikramavidaḥ*) and wishes to interpret all evidence to the contrary as a mere emphasis of the first teacher of the lineage. But it is hard to imagine that authors in a tradition that is defined by their line of teachers would be so careless. SANDERSON has proposed a convincing solution, namely to emend in what seems to be Jayaratha's only textual evidence for the insertion of a Somadeva – i.e. TĀ 37.61d: *śrīsomataḥ sakalavit kila śaṃbhunāthaḥ* – the word *somataḥ* to *saumataḥ*: "a disciple of Sumati"!

21 *īdānīm – upādhyāyād daśācārya ācāryāṇāṃ śataṃ pitā – ityādyuktyā tasyācāryād api gauravātirekasmṛter nijam api pitaram āśīrvādamukhena parāmṛśati – yaḥ pūrṇānandaviśrāntasarvaśāstrārthapāragaḥ | sa śrīcukhulako diśyād iṣṭaṃ me gurur uttamaḥ* ||1.12|| *– cukhulaka iti lokaprasiddham asya nāmāntaram | gurur uttama iti uttamatvasya ācāryagauravātirekasmṛtir eva nimittam, ata eva anyatrāpi* [i.e. in MVV] *– gurubhyo 'pi garīyāṃsaṃ janakaṃ cukhulābhidham | – ityādy uktaṃ*. See BÜHLER (1979) for the controversial interpretation of *Manusmṛti* 2.145 and 146.

tion received from his father could be hinted at.[22] Furthermore it could refer to the normal Vedic *saṃskāras* performed by the father for the son, including the *medhājanana*,[23] or even a Śaiva initiation.

In order to determine the most likely interpretation, it would be necessary to ascertain whether Abhinavagupta's father was a Śaiva, or even a Śaiva *ācārya*. For if he was, a reference to Vedic rites would be less likely. But the evidence for this is not without problems. Abhinava's father is described by him as his teacher in grammar, logic and poetics; he also developed devotion to Śiva[24] and received *dīkṣā* from Bhūtirāja.[25] Finally there is one reference to an *ācārya* Narasiṃha in the *Vārttika*,[26] which in the absence of other persons of that name could well be to his father.

At the moment the evidence is not conclusive; we can only exclude the possibility that Narasiṃhagupta initiated his son into Śaivism, for this would have surely be mentioned elsewhere. Perhaps he became a Śaiva initiate only after his son.

verse 6

The contradiction with the preceding verse, where his father has been said to be higher than the teachers, is only apparent, because Bhūtirāja was also his father's teacher.

verse 7

The compound *saṃvidāmodasandarbha* is the turning point of the verse where the two levels of meaning are indicated and merged: "the compositions of the fragrance (*āmoda*) that is the bliss (*āmoda*) of consciousness". The poetical figure is that of an identification (*rūpaka*) of the thing to be compared (*upameya*) and the standard of comparison (*upamāna*).[27] The poetical image is that of the

---

22 Cf. *Bṛhadvimarśinī*, vol. 3 p. 405, v. 2 *saṃskṛtamati*.

23 Thus the "*saṃskṛtamati*", too, would be covered. I am grateful to Prof. SLAJE for this interpretation.

24 Compare e.g., *saṃsāravṛttāntaparāṅmukho yaḥ śivaikacittaś cukhalābhidhānaḥ*, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, concluding verse 12cd, and *yaṃ sarvaśāstrarasamajjanaśubhracittaṃ māheśvarī param alaṃkurute sma bhaktiḥ*, TĀ 37.54cd.

25 Prof. SANDERSON alerted me to ĪPVV, concluding verse 1 (vol. III, p. 405), where the father is described as *śivamārganiṣṭhaḥ* and as "one in whom all darkness of existence has been destroyed by the ray of reality from the Śaiva Śāstra spoken by Bhūtirāja." (*śrībhūtirājavadanoditaśaṃbhuśāstratattvāṃśuśātitasamastabhavāndhakāraḥ*).

26 I.764a

27 A similar compound appears in the example verse to Mammaṭa's *Kāvyaprakāśa* 10.95 (p. 373), where a *paramparitarūpaka* based on a *śleṣa* is demonstrated: *vidvanmānasa-*

moon enjoying the beauty of the night-blossoming water-lilies that open only under his influence. For the translation of the *upamāna śrīmat* has to be understood literally as "possessing beauty".

TĀ 1.10 is closely parallel to this verse and Jayaratha in his commentary points out that Somānanda is the teacher who first undertook the investigation (*tarka*), i.e. laid the foundation of the philosophy of Pratyabhijñā.[28] His disciple Utpaladeva holds the position of being *the* commentator thereon. Elsewhere Abhinavagupta introduces a quotation from Somānanda's main work, the *Śivadṛṣṭi*, as "[the text of] our lineage".[29] But in fact this text does not know of the concept of Pratyabhijñā and from a historical perspective it is more correct to call Utpaladeva the founder of this school of thought.[30]

verse 8

The position of *taddṛṣṭi* may be explained by its referring back to the preceding verse. To take *taddṛṣṭi* as not congruent with *pratyabhijñā* would result in a clumsy interpretation ("who teaches the recognition which cuts off *saṃsāra* through his system"). *taddṛṣṭi* could be seen to refer to Somānanda's philosophical system by alluding to the name of the work (*Śivadṛṣṭi*) or, preferably, to Utpaladeva's system, the *Pratyabhijñākārikā*. In this way the *guruparampārā* Somānanda → Utpaladeva → Lakṣmaṇagupta → Abhinavagupta is completed.[31]

Lakṣmaṇagupta, Utpaladeva's disciple, was Abhinavagupta's teacher in the Pratyabhijñā. No work of his seems to have survived. RASTOGI however says that "the only definite word in this behalf is met with in a statement where he is stated to have produced a work called 'Śrīśāstra' ".[32] He then argues for the identification of Lakṣmaṇagupta with Lakṣmaṇa Deśika, the author of the *Śāradātilaka*, on the testimony of the commentator Rāghava Bhaṭṭa.[33] This

---

haṃsa, 'O swan in the *mānasa* lake, which is the mind of the learned'.

28 The reading of TĀ 1.10 is suspicious: *śrīsomānandabodhaśrīmadutpalaviniṣṛtaḥ*. Here the caesura is inelegant, as it splits *śrīmat*, and one might consider reading with the *Vārttika* here, for the wording of the TĀ is not secured by the commentary. But this is difficult to decide, as the author might have consciously positioned *śrīmat* in this way in order to point to the intended interpretation.

29 PTV, p. 178: *saṃpradāyaprathamāhnike 'pi …*

30 Cf. TORELLA (1994a), Introduction, p. XX and passim.

31 For more up to date information on Pratyabhijñā, see TORELLA's excellent introduction to his edition and translation of Utpaladeva's auto-commentary on the ĪPK (TORELLA (1994a)).

32 RASTOGI (1979), p. 147.

33 Rāghava Bhaṭṭa on *Śāradātilaka* 1.3 and 5.138f trying to fabricate an ancient authorship for

would lead us to the absurd conclusion that the *Śāradātilaka* was one of the earliest Śrīvidyā works, written by the teacher of Abhinavagupta, but without any trace of the "philosophy of recognition", instead describing Śiva with the Vedāntic term *saccidānanda* (1.7).[34] Apart from the commentator's wish to link the work to the Kashmirian Pratyabhijñā lineage, we have only a statement from the ĪPVV that is adduced by RASTOGI in order to prove his theory that Lakṣmaṇagupta composed a "*Śrīśāstra*". But this rests on a misunderstanding. In fact, the line in question, (*śrīśāstrakṛdghaṭitalakṣmaṇaguptapādasatyopadarśitaśivādvayavādadṛptaḥ*, ĪPVV III, p. 406) means: "I [Abhinavagupta] have become proud through the doctrine of identity with Śiva, which has been shown to me by the sincerity of the venerable Lakṣmaṇagupta, who has reached his goal/was united [with Śiva] (*ghaṭita*) by the author of the glorious Śāstra", i.e. by Utpaladeva as the author of the ĪPK!

verses 9–10

The form *āpya* has been noted as irregular by Śaraṇadeva (*Durghaṭavṛtti*, ed. RENOU, vol. 2.2, p. 80ff.), which is more realistic than to explain it as being derived from *ā-āp*.

By assuming an irregular, but by no means infrequent use of *api* in the wrong position (*bhinnakrama*) we arrive at a more convincing interpretation than to translate, for instance: "I hope (*api*) that through him (*yena*) the bee of my mind [...].

Nāda is translated as "doctrine" to make the *śleṣa* clearer; it is – of course – doctrine on the undifferentiated level of speech.

The "intoxication" reappears in a slightly different context in the concluding stanzas of the TĀ, where he takes the reader on a short trip through his intellectual and spiritual life: After having been introduced into the "thicket of words", i.e. grammar, by his father, and after having purified his mind with drops from the ocean of logic, it was during the enjoyment of the intense emotions of poetry that he was seized by an intoxicating devotion to Śiva which came completely by itself. As a consequence he did not "value the way of the world" any more and went to different teachers who are then described.[35] This might be taken as the context of the two stanzas under discussion.

---

the work.

34 To my best knowledge only *cidānanda* ever is used by Abhinavagupta and his predecessors!

35 *pitrā sa śabdagahane kṛtasampraveśas tarkārṇavormipṛṣatāmalapūtacittaḥ sāhityasāndrarasabhogaparo maheśabhaktyā svayaṃgrahaṇadurmadayā gṛhītaḥ* 37.58 | *sa tanmayībhūya na lokavartanīm ajīgaṇat kām api kevalaṃ punaḥ tadīyasaṃbhogavivṛddhaye purā karoti dāsyaṃ guruveśmasu svayam* ||37.59||.

In the poet's imagination the "bee" goes from one plant to another in search for new taste as soon as it is dissatisfied.[36] It is used by Abhinavagupta as a metaphor for the disciple who goes from teacher to teacher to find the highest doctrine, but also in other contexts.[37] This attitude is reflected in the permission to go to other *gurus*, if one cannot get full knowledge from the present one.[38] Given the doctrinal and social context, this metaphor is not far from describing religious conversion,[39] as becomes clear from one passage in the *Tantrāloka*: in a description of the characteristics of a teacher, Abhinavagupta quotes his teacher Śambhunātha, who taught that one ought to adopt only a Guru who is well grounded in knowledge. "[Every] other [teacher] one should give up, even if already accepted. For this is taught by Śiva ...".[40] Jayaratha refers to a rule, which promises death to a disciple who abandons his teacher[41] to introduce the quotation from an unnamed scriptural source that immediately follows in the TĀ: "As a bee searching for fragrance wanders from one flower to the next, a disciple desirous of knowledge should wander from one teacher to the next."[42] As another predecessor who followed this method, he quotes Kallaṭa, who said: "The sequence of my teachers ranges from Tapana to Moṭaka.[43] Being a disciple of everyone, I am not short in teaching."[44] And Abhinava adds that he even went to teachers of lower doctrines and indicates that the same is implied in the *Mālinī*, where the sages who come to hear the doctrine were previously

36 Cf. *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*, Madhukarānyokti 15.

37 For instance in *Tantrāloka* 1.11 (applied to Lakṣmaṇagupta) and *Tantrasāra*, p. 38.

38 In TĀ 13.341 he says that if there is no one person who has complete knowledge, one should take the things one can learn part by part and complete one's insight in this way. Therefore one may take countless *gurus* for the completion of one's own consciousness. *jñānī na pūrṇa evaiko yadi hy aṃśāṃśikākramāt | jñānāny ādāya vijñānaṃ kurvītākhaṇḍamaṇḍalam ||*

39 When laying down the rules for teaching the Āgama (*vyākhyāna*), Abhinavagupta says that the teacher can explain the Śāstra to his own disciples, to those of others and, as he is full of compassion, also to those of lower systems like Vaiṣṇavas; he might also teach adherents of the lowest doctrines, bearing in mind that the power of Śiva may fall in different ways – and even to unexpected recipients. (TĀ 28.395f)

40 *mokṣajñānaparaḥ kuryād guruṃ svabhyastavedanam | anyaṃ tyajet prāptam api tathā coktaṃ śivena tat* ||13.334||.

41 This is no doubt to be seen as an *arthavāda*, as Jayaratha himself says that this indicates only the *doṣa* in abandoning one's teacher.

42 *āmodārthī yathā bhṛṅgaḥ puṣpāt puṣpāntaraṃ vrajet | vijñānārthī tathā śiṣyo guror gurvantaraṃ vrajet* ||13.335||

43 The idiom is not known from anywhere else, but probably means: "from A to Z".

44 *ā tapanān moṭakāntaṃ yasya me 'sti gurukramaḥ | tasya me sarvaśiṣyasya nopadeśadaridratā* ||13.344|| Quoted from the concluding verse of Kallaṭa's *Vṛtti* on the *Spandakārikā*.

Vaiṣṇavas, then Buddhists [?], Saiddhāntikas etc. and finally became eager to see the "moon of knowledge that is the doctrine of the Trika."[45]

Since the monistic forms of Śaivism were in direct confrontation and competition with the dualistic Śaiva-Siddhāntins, the socio-religious context of this elaborate argumentation, which tries to give support to this form of religious "upward" mobility, is a missionary one.

The metaphor of the bee has also been adopted in *Gurunāthaparāmarśa* 28 to describe Abhinavagupta's teaching:[46]

> After being purified [only] by the sound of bathing in the perfume of the river of flower-juice that is the sweet talk about non-duality of the nature of Śiva, even a devotee completely ignorant like me, is made to resound by the bee of speech on the lotus of the mouth of Abhinavaguptanātha: "Śiva, Śiva".

verses 11–12

Abhinavagupta's brother-in-law Karṇa, who is also mentioned in PTV, concluding verse 7, as a young person, had died before the completion of the TĀ.[47]

---

45 *śrīpūrvaśāstre prastāro munayo nāradādayaḥ* ||13.347|| *prāg vaiṣṇavāḥ saugatāś ca siddhāntādividas tataḥ* | *kramāt trikārthavijñānacandrotsukitadṛṣṭayaḥ* ||13.348|| It is conceivable that the sages mentioned in MVT 1.2–3 could have been imagined as being adherents of Viṣṇu (known from the Purāṇa) and gradually ascended via Siddhānta up to the Trika, but the reason for them being Buddhists previously is not clear.

46 *madhuramaheśatādvayakathāmakarandadhunī-*
parimalamajjanadhvanipavitritabhaktajanam |
abhinavaguptanāthavadanāmbujavāgbhramarī
śiva śiva gāḍhamūḍham api māṃ mukharīkaroti ||
-janam in pāda b is my conjecture for *-janā*.

47 TĀ 37.65: *śrīśaurisaṃjñatanayaḥ kila karṇanāmā yo yauvane viditaśāṃbhavatattvasāraḥ* | *dehaṃ tyajan prathayati sma janasya satyaṃ yogacyutaṃ prati mahāmunikṛṣṇavākyam* || "Karṇa, the son of Śauri, who as a youth had already experienced the essence of the reality of God, has by giving up his body shown that the word of the great seer Kṛṣṇa about those fallen from Yoga is true." RASTOGI's account is slightly confused: "Karṇa's young wife Ambā also grew detached from the worldly affairs and devoted herself exclusively to the worship of Śiva when her husband died later at an advanced age."(RASTOGI (1987), p. 23) For this he quotes verse 77 which mentions that his wife was deprived of her husband at an *early* age (*agre vayasi*). *agre* could mean "advanced", but this makes hardly any sense in the context. On the contrary the verse from the TĀ is an indication that Karṇa died early: the passage from the *Bhagavadgītā* as identified by GNOLI talks of those fallen from Yoga (*yogabhraṣṭa*). Kṛṣṇa replies to Arjuna's anxious question on the fate of one who is unable to attain the perfection of Yoga (6.37). The answer is that he is born under good circumstances (42) or even in the house of Yogis (43) and is able to attain perfection quickly. In

This is further indication that the *Vārttika* predates the TĀ. Mandra, son of a minister, was a friend of Karṇa from childhood.[48]

In *11c* the reading *vartaye* that I have accepted does not give any other meaning than *kathaye*, but is presumably the *lectio difficilior*.

The passsage that describes the author's method, or rather philosophy of interpretation (*11cd–12*), is involved and the history of my obsolete attempts to interpret this passage is no less complicated.[49] Abhinavagupta emphasizes that his explanations focus on "sentences" (*vākya*) or statements of a scripture. The reason for this is perhaps the peculiar exegetical principle of the Trika, through which the author constructs a hierarchy of doctrines in a single Tantric text: not the complete text is explained as a unit, but different layers are attributed to levels inside the doctrine, like the *tantraprakriyā*, *kulaprakriyā*, *mata* etc.[50] A commentator on the *Mālinīvijayottaratantra* therefore has to structure material according to levels of meaning: the chapter on the Kaula rejection of outer ritual cannot be interpreted on the same level as the description of concrete ritual, and is not invalidated by it. The lower level, i.e. the injunction of ritual, is taught, but cancelled on the higher level. This gradationist model is in fact an intelligent way to maintain the internal consistency (*ekavākyatā*) that is demanded for the demonstration of the validity of Āgamas as a whole to the outsider. In the *Vārttika* Abhinavagupta aims at these more esoteric levels of meaning and therefore has to justify the omission of the lower doctrines (*itara*) that are also part of the *Mālinītantra*. The word *vartanam* ("Verfahren", pw) would in this interpretation refer to the different practices taught on these various levels, and is therefore more or less synonymous with [*sam*]*ācāra*.

verse 13

There is probably no one translation for the frequent word-game with the author's name and the translation given is just one possible interpretation. In a

---

our context this means that Karṇa, through his enlightenment at an early age, has proved to be a former *yogabhraṣṭa* who has now quickly obtained (final) liberation. It is also a subtle way of showing respect for his sister's relatives.

48 Understood in this way, the compound *tadbālamitram* in TĀ 37.66 could be related to the fact that they are often described together; GNOLI's translation ("Amico di questo fanciullo …") is less likely, as he is mentioned as the instigation for writing the *Vārttika* where he must have been even younger.

49 For some time I worked on the assumption that *12cd* referred directly to *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.4.102 *kathādibhyaṣ ṭhak*, depending on the *adhikārasūtram*: *tatra sādhuḥ* [4.4.98]. Fortunately Dr. Peri Sarveśvara Śarma convinced me that *etasmin sādhu* is not *tatra sādhuḥ*, and that Abhinavagupta's practice of not quoting literally would not extend to Pāṇini.

50 See SANDERSON (1997) on the levels of initiation in the Trika. Cf. also PTV, p. 91f.

similar instance – in TĀ 4.278: "Only the extraordinary sage Abhinavagupta is fit to perform this sacrifice",[51] – Jayaratha tries to fill the name with doctrinal meaning:

> "He who is *everywhere* (*abhi*) – that is in the multitude of conscious and unconscious [objects] that are completely divided into innumerable fragments like subject, object etc. – *preserved* (*gupta*) – i.e. with his pervading (*vaibhava*), omniform nature guarded although obscured through the delusion *māyā* – through the *praise* (*nava*) of the self that is an awareness of the qualities that are unbroken ability to know and act; and therefore only [such] an extraordinary being, [i.e.] the author [*abhi-nava-gupta*] is fit [to perform this sacrifice]. This is the meaning."[52]

51 *yogyo 'bhinavagupto 'smin ko 'pi yāgavidhau budhaḥ* ||

52 The synonyms given in the commentary are omitted in the translation (*navaḥ = stava, ko 'pi = alaukikaḥ* etc.). *abhito grāhyagrāhakādyanantabhedasaṃbhinne jaḍājaḍavarge yo navaḥ anavacchinnajñatvakartṛtvātmakaguṇaparāmarśanarūpaḥ svātmastavaḥ tena guptaḥ māyāvyāmohamuṣitatve 'pi parirakṣitasārvātmyamayanijavaibhavaḥ ata eva ca ko'pi alaukikaḥ atha ca evaṃvidho 'yam eva granthakāro 'tra yogya ity arthaḥ* | Cf. also ĪPV 2.3.1: *abhinavodayaḥ iti abhinavaḥ kṣaṇavāsaparimlānyāpi na kalaṅkitaḥ, tena navanavodaya ity uktaṃ bhavati*, vol. 2, p. 66f.

Section 2
The Mūlasūtra

verse 14

This is a full quotation of the introductory verse to the MVT. Saiddhāntika commentators like Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II are anxious to identify the first verse or statement (*mūlasūtra*) in a Tantra, for it contains the entire work in essence.[1] It is situated often at the end of the introductory dialogue. To my knowledge Abhinavagupta does not apply this terminology to the *Mālinī*, although it is part of the exegetical repertoire of his school.[2] But his commentary shows that the introductory invocation (*maṅgalaśloka*) is, or is equivalent to, a *mūlasūtra*.

In some way the first part of the text that is translated here explains the second line of this verse, namely the philosophical implications of the image of the rays of the moon on Śiva's head that are reflected in and exuded from his face. The justification for Abhinava's laborious attempt to work out the philosophical details lies in the identification of the moon with knowledge.[3] In its descent the light of knowledge articulates itself in successively grosser stages and thus becomes the Āgama, i.e. Śaiva scripture. Connected to this spatial descent is a descent into creation: the knowledge embodied in this revelation becomes diversified as the world is being differentiated from consciousness on the lower levels of the universe. The crucial stage of differentiation is however that into five powers represented as Śiva's five faces.

With this interpretation our author tries to demonstrate not only the philosophical side of the dictum that the Āgama are valid, because they are taught by Śiva, but also how a diversity of Āgamas with sometimes incompatible doctrines can be attributed to a single deity. But this is not a service done by a non-sectarian to the Śaiva community; for Abhinavagupta only the Trika – of which

---

1 See Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary on *Kiraṇatantra* 1.12 (GOODALL (1995), p. 11 of the edition).

2 Cf. TĀV 28.406: *vācyaṃ vastv iti mūlasūtrādi*.

3 The crucial compound *jñānacandra* is quoted in *399* to mark the end of the first chapter of the *Vārttika*.

the MVT is for him the most important text – can explain this structure, because through being part of the highest knowledge, while simultaneously encompassing its lower expressions, it is the essence of the whole revelation.

Section 3
The Nature of Knowledge

verses 15–17ab

Vaibhavam in *15d* is adopted as the *lectio difficilior.*

For his conjecture in *16a* Prof. SANDERSON has adduced the use of the verb *tan* throughout the *Vārttika*: *tāyante 49c*, *tenire 161b*, *tanvate 164b*, *tanute* II, *201c*.

Here the main part of the commentary starts by examining the meaning of the "knowledge" mentioned in MVT 1.1 and by introducing some of the key ideas that are discussed later in the work: the identity of the "limitless reality", i.e. the highest form of Śiva, with the world (*15ab*); the appearance of diversity without division from the source in the simile of the light and its rays; and the description of consciousness itself (*hṛdayam* = *cid* [1]) as an active and creative awareness.[2]

The whole passage has some similarity with ĪPK 1.5.13–14, where the nature of "cognition" (*citi*) is described as "*vimarśa*" and with a set of synonyms, and is then summarized as "the heart of the supreme Lord".

An exegetical etymology for *hṛdaya*, which shows that the heart of Śiva stands for consciousness itself, is given by Abhinava in the *Parātriṃśikā-vivaraṇa* (p. 61):

> "*hṛt* is consciousness, the ultimate foundation of everything, [that is] of [objects] like "blue", or "joy" and of [limited identities like] "body", "life force", "mind" and [emptiness].[3] Its "*aya*s" are the various cognitions like those [of material objects] like pots etc. that are held in division by its own autonomy."[4]

---

1 *hṛdayaṃ bodhaparyāyaḥ*, see *Mṛgendratantra*, Vidyāpāda 1.3.11c

2 For further information on this philosophical position, see TORELLA (1994a), p. 111–127.

3 The series normally includes the *śūnyapramātṛ*.

4 *sarvasya nīlasukhāder dehaprāṇabuddhyādeś ca paraṃ pratiṣṭhāsthānaṃ saṃvidātma hṛt* | *tasyaiva nijasvātantryakalpitabhedā ayā vicitrāṇi ghaṭādijñānāni* | The word *aya* is

I have translated the term *vimarśa* and the other derivations of the verbal root *mṛś*, depending on the context, by "awareness" or "articulation".[5] Unlike *cit* and other words for consciousness, *vimarśa* implies "awareness *of something*", and in the Pratyabhijñā philosophy this "awareness of" is always concomitant with a verbal representation of the object, in other words, there is no pure, non-verbal and non-differential cognition of an object.[6] In most cases *vimarśa* is therefore more or less equivalent to *vikalpa*, but there is an important exception: "The awareness "I" is not a differential thought".[7] The "I" in this context is not the sense of individuality (*aham*) and possession (*mama*), which belongs to the artificial (*kṛtrima*) self and is otherwise called *ahaṃkāra*, but stands for the "full identity" (*pūrṇāhantā*) that includes everything. But *ahaṃpratyavamarśa* has a further connotation: the "articulation of *ahaṃ*" describes the stage in the development of consciousness, in which language appears in an "essential form", as a contraction of all sounds of the Sanskrit alphabet, starting from *a* and ending with *ha*, while their non-distinction is symbolized by the *bindu "ṃ"*.

---

artificially formed from the verbal root *i* in the sense of cognition (compare *itiḥ*): *tad uktaṃ somānandapādaiḥ svavivṛtau 'hṛdy ayo gamanaṃ jñānam' ityādi*, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, p. 63.

5 The latter meaning was proposed by Prof. SANDERSON in the context of "phonematic" articulation (*varṇaparāmarśa*).

6 "The nature of articulation (*pratyavamarśa*) is to produce sound (*śabdanam*) which is inner expression". *pratyavamarśaś ca antarabhilāpātmakaśabdanasvabhāvaḥ*, ĪPV 1.5.13, vol. 1, p. 205.

7 *aham iti pratyavamarśaḥ asau vikalpo na bhavati* ĪPV 1.6.1, vol. 1, p. 239. There is one passage where Abhinavagupta tries to emphasize this point by using *vimarśa* for the *vikalpa*-variety and *pratyavamarśa* for non-differential awareness (*śuddhe 'haṃpratyavamarśe 'pohanavyāpārāsaṃbhavaḥ* ĪPV 1.6.1, vol. 1, p. 237; *ityādivimarśaḥ sa vikalpa eva, na tu śuddhaṃ pratyavamarśamātram* ĪPV 1.6.5, vol. 1, p. 248), but I have not found any indication of a systematic differentiation in meaning between *āmarśa, parāmarśa, vimarśa* etc.

Section 4
The Trika

verses 17cd–20ab

mayaṭ in *svātmamayī* can be understood in the sense of "being a part of something" (*avayave*, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.3.135 and 143).

In this context *parā* in *20a* most probably refers to *parāvāk*.

For *ūrmi*, cf. the description of the first moment of desire for creation in *Śivadṛṣṭivṛtti*: "This urge is called a subtle swelling by Pradyumnabhaṭṭa in his *Tattvagarbhastotra* and 'wave', 'flow' etc. by others."[1]

In the first few verses the author has defined the highest reality more or less in the terminology of the Pratyabhijñā; in this passage the same reality is described in terms of a pantheon. This process is followed throughout the text and aims at placing schools that adhere to these pantheons on a hierarchy of levels thereby subsuming three aspects: (1) a level of reality (*tattva*) with the corresponding experience of liberation; (2) a pantheon which identifies a specific school that focusses on this level of reality; (3) a revelatory scripture that is the direct expression of the corresponding reality-level, that teaches it and that provides the means to attain it.

Applied to our passage this means that the experience of the unity of Śiva and his power is described in terms of the Trika pantheon as the equilibrium of the three powers (*20*). In the evolution of the Śāstra this level corresponds to the "highest face" of Śiva that is – as he will argue later – different from the "upper face" (i.e. Īśāna) (*162*). The use of the word *visarga* in *18d*, in a phrase that is almost identical with *Śivadṛṣṭi* 1.10b, suggests that this highest face is to

---

1 *yad etad aunmukhyaṃ, saiva kiṃciducchūnatā kathyate bhaṭṭapradyumnena tattvagarbhe* | *anyair api taraṅgormyādiśabdair api* |, p. 16. The *Tattvagarbhastotra* is lost except for some quotations. Amongst these is a verse which mentions the term in question: *kiṃcid-ucchūnatāpatter unmeṣādipadābhidhāḥ* | *pravartante tvayi śive śaktitā te yadāmbike* ||. See DVIVEDA (1983a), p. 55f, for a compilation of the verses cited in different sources and DYCZKOWSKI (1992), p. 291, for the author.

be identified with the *kaula* aspect of the Trika.[2]

A list of synonyms for the "supreme reality" that is similar to the one in *20ab* is to be found in Kṣemarāja's *Parāpraveśikā*: "This awareness (*vimarśa*) is described in the Āgamas with words like 'consciousness, sentiency ...'.[3] The motivation for providing such a list of identifications might be the fact that the term *vimarśa* is not a concept found in early Tantras.[4]

Jayaratha explains *saṃghaṭṭa* as "the fusion of Śiva and his power"[5] and adds that the heart, although by nature inexpressible, is expressed by the word Trika in the highest sense, which denotes this fusion.[6] Abhinavagupta uses the phrase "perfection through union" (*saṃghaṭṭasamāpattyā*) in the PTV.[7] This 'union', besides being a sexual metaphor, implies, on the level of the phonemes, the union of the primary reality denoted by *a* [=*anuttara*] with its own identity [*a* + *a*], which leads to *ā* [=*ānanda*].

verses 20cd–21

Unless we emend to ...*mātraṃ mātr*..., we have to understand *mātra* to refer to *trayam*. I have provisionally accepted this as a peculiarity of Abhinavagupta's style.

As mentioned above, the main thesis of this part of the work is the demonstration of a congruence between the structure of reality as conceptualized in the Śaiva systems and the structure of the Śaiva canon, in order to lend special justification to the Trika as the only system which comprises this structure. In the Trika the primordial reality is threefold and the highest state is defined by the dissolution of these three powers in bliss. This experience, which is equivalent to liberation, is characterized not by the absence of the world, but by the absence of "contraction through fear". In the present context *śaṅkā*

---

2 See below on the term *visarga*, and SANDERSON (1997) for the differentiation between Kula and Kaula.

3 *eṣa eva ca vimarśaś cit caitanyaṃ, svarasoditā parā vāk, svātantryaṃ, paramātmano mukhyam aiśvaryaṃ, kartṛtvaṃ, sphurattā, sāro, hṛdayaṃ, spanda ityādiśabdair āgameṣūdghoṣyate*. (p. 2) The model for such lists is probably ĪPK 1.5.13–14.

4 For the identification of some of these terms, see SANDERSON (1995), p. 70f, where āgamic sources for a similar list are given.

5 TĀV 1.1: *śaktiśaktimatsāmarasyātmā saṃghaṭṭaḥ* (p. 4).

6 TĀV 1.1: *tad evam atra visargaprasarasvabhāvatvena jagadvaicitryabījabhūtaṃ śivaśaktisaṃghaṭṭātmakaparatrikaśabdavācyam anākhyātmakaṃ vighnaughapradhvaṃsāya parāmṛṣṭam* (p. 7). This is then followed by the quotation of our passage from the *Vārttika*.

7 *tad evaṃ khecarīsāmyam eva mokṣaḥ | tac cānuttarasvarūpaparijñānam eva satatoditaṃ parameśvaryāḥ śivātmani saṃghaṭṭasamāpattyā ubhayavimarśānandarūḍhi |*, p. 45.

and *saṃkoca* describe the same phenomenon as cause and effect,[8] but the connotation of *śaṅkā* needs further elaboration.[9] As a philosophical concept *śaṅkā* describes the condition of the individual trying to protect his identity by excluding things or experiences that seem to threaten it, and thereby continuously recreating his limited, "artificial" identity (*kṛtrimāham*). More specifically these limitations were described as "eight possessors" (*graha*): "obsession with caste (*jātigraha*), Vedic learning (*vidyā-*), the social standing of one's family (*kula-*), with orthodox conduct (*ācāra-*) ..."[10] Psychologically complementing these identifications were the "fear of loss of identity (*ātmaśaṅkā*), of participation in non-Vedic rites (*divyakaraśaṅkā*), of impure Tantric incantations (*mantraśaṅkā*), fear of contact with the forbidden substances that are offered and consumed in Tantric worship (*dravyaśaṅkā*) ..."[11] Behind these formulations were of course the transgressive practises of the heterodox cults like the Kula or Krama,[12] where the gratification of female deities with forbidden substances was enjoined in order to overcome these inhibitions and thus transcend one's limited identity.[13]

verses 22–24ab

In *22a śaivadṛṣṭau* is used as a metrically correct variant for *śivadṛṣṭau*.

Somānanda's *Śivadṛṣṭi* 1. 3–4 is quoted several times as the authority for this idea.[14] The syntax of the second line of the quotation (*23ab*) requires some explanation. I translate the relevant portion of Utpaladeva's commentary:

> "But in the supreme [non-dual] state one's own nature shines forth as 'I am complete'. As it shines as this [experience], it is cognition; as it is of the nature of energy, it is action; as we accept it to be of this nature, volition also exists [there]; – therefore he says 'then this is volition ...'. [Because of the neuter *tāvat*] we have to construe 'and action is [of] that nature'. Alternatively the *tāvat* that refers to *jñānaṃ* could be read [a second time] as

8 See TĀ 12.20cd, where both appear in a list of closely related terms: *tathāhi śaṅkā mālinyaṃ glāniḥ saṃkoca ityadaḥ.*

9 For the following, see SANDERSON (1985), p. 198ff.

10 SANDERSON (1985), fn. 69. The word is used in the same pregnant sense in Kṣemendra's *Deśopadeśa* 8.11: *madhupāne kṛtabuddhiḥ kaulakathānaṣṭajātisaṃkocaḥ* ..., "Having resolved to drink alcohol, his obsession with caste destroyed by Kaula doctrines (lit. disputation) ...".

11 SANDERSON (1985), fn. 69.

12 See commentary on verses *42–45*.

13 See TĀ 12.18–26 and PTV, p. 235f., for details of this argument.

14 *Bṛhadvimarśinī* I, p. 184; II, p. 134; III, p. 252; *Parātriṃśikavivaraṇa*, p. 178.

a feminine [to agree with] *kriyā*, and the second *tāvat* at the end could have the sense of 'succession' with reference to the state intermediate [between non-duality and duality]."[15]

It has been observed that Abhinavagupta's method of quotation is problematic, if one wishes to establish the exact wording of the quoted text.[16] Similar problems occur when he names the source as a/the *guru*. I propose distinguishing the instances in the *Vārttika* into three types:

1. In combination with a name or title of a work: the passage discussed here *22*; *yad uvācotpalagurur 270a*; *śrīmadutpalagurur nyarūpayat 696c*; *guruḥ śaṅkaranandanaḥ 431a*; *nirṇītā lolaṭākhyena guruṇā lokasaṃmatā 778ab*; *ye śrīmadbhavatītyākhyagurupādopasevinaḥ 835ab*.

2. "my *guru*": *asmadgurugṛhe 394a*; *asmākaṃ gurur jagau* II, *40*.

3. "*guru*s" in general: *gurur ūcivān 32b*; *gurubhir bhāṣitāni 165d*;[17] *tathāhi gurur ādikṣad* II, *111c*;[18] *asmadguruvargasya* II.*264a*.

---

15 *parāvasthāyāṃ punaḥ pūrṇo 'ham ity eva svasvabhāvaḥ prakāśate, tāvatprakāśatvāt tad eva jñānaṃ, saṃraṃbharūpatvāt saiva kriyā, tatsvabhāvatvena tadabhyupagamād icchāpi sthitaivety āha tad icchā tāvatīti* | *tāvac ca svarūpaṃ kriyeti yojyam* | *athavā tāvajjñānam iti tāvacchabdaḥ kriyāyāṃ strīliṅgaḥ pariṇamanīyaḥ* | *dvitīyas tv ante tāvacchabdaḥ kramārthaḥ parāparādyavasthāpekṣaḥ* |, *Śivadṛṣṭivṛtti* 1.3–4.

16 "He seldom quotes, usually paraphrases" GOUDRIAAN AND GUPTA (1981), p. 163. In the TĀV Jayaratha fortunately tries his best to provide the reader with quotations of passages that have been summarized in the TĀ, but this evidence is usually not without its own problems.

17 This could also refer to Śaṃbhunātha, as in *394a*, but equally to the whole *paraṃparā* otherwise called the "disciples" of Sumati (see above).

18 GNOLI has argued that this passage is an allusion to the *Svabodhodayamañjarī* of Vāmanadatta and TORELLA has indicated the possibility that the author of the *Saṃvitprakāśa* might be identical with Abhinavagupta's teacher Vāmanaka (see TĀ 37.62). This issue is problematic, since there is no consensus as to whether the author of the *Svabodhodayamañjarī* and the author of the *Saṃvitprakāśa* are identical. TORELLA has with caution tended to subscribe to this view, (TORELLA (1994b), p. 482, fn. 4) DYCZKOWSKI rejects it (DYCZKOWSKI (1992), p. 305). A review of the question can be postponed until all the texts involved are edited, but it is now at least improbable that the author of the *Saṃvitprakāśa* was Abhinavagupta's teacher. SANDERSON has recently identified a direct quotation from Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II in the *Tantrāloka* (8.428–434b; see GOODALL (1995), p. iii). The fact that it is not an attack against the dualists might suggest that Rāmakaṇṭha was even a senior contemporary of Abhinavagupta whom he would not attack directly; and the fact that Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, Rāmakaṇṭha's father, quotes the *Saṃvitprakāśa* makes a direct connection between Abhinava and the author of the *Saṃvitprakāśa* unlikely.

The references under 1. are unproblematic, those under 2. can, at least in the works on Trika, be interpreted as referring to his teacher in the Trika, Śaṃbhunātha. None of the instances under 3. can be interpreted with any certainty; they might refer to a specific person in the honorific plural, to Śaṃbhunātha or to *guru*s in general.

4.1 Śāstra as the Knowledge Inherent in Consciousness

If the *pūrvapakṣa* had remained silent here, the structure of the whole work would have emerged more clearly. But the question initiates a protracted discussion of the "basics" of Pratyabhijñā and their bearing on the concept of revealed scripture.

verses 24cd–25ab
The *pūrvapakṣa* raises one of the main problems in the author's argumentation. It may seem strange that the opponent argues against a thesis that has not yet been made, but I suppose that the proposition that is perceived to be problematic can be inferred from *17a*, where it was stated that the primordial reality is essentially "articulation" (*abhimarśa*), and that one would have to understand this as an interpretation of MVT 1.1. The question therefore really means: if the rays emitting from Śiva's mouth are the source of the Śāstra and the further development of the world[19] and reflect his consciousness without distortion, and if, moreover, Śiva is conceived of as a non-dual reality, then the existence of a Śāstra, or even a plurality of Śāstras with potentially conflicting theories and injunctions, cannot be explained, as they would depend on differential thought, which is excluded in a non-dual reality. The question is not really settled until *49* and the answer deals with various issues involved: the relationship between light and knowledge, light as a direct expression of the knowledge inherent in it, inclusive non-duality, differentiation without real division, absence of time etc.

There are several ways to understand the compound *śāstrādisaṃpadaḥ* and the related phrases in *39* and *49*. Theoretically *saṃpad* and, especially, *vibhūti* (*49*) could be taken to mean *siddhi*, but this is debarred by the context. Taking *saṃpad* merely as a plural marker is possible,[20] yet the interpretation as an

19 As the Śāstra is created before duality becomes manifest, it is created before the world; *ādi* could therefore mean "the world of duality".

20 Like *saṃcaya* in *śivacandrāṃśusaṃcayān* in *13d*.

avadhāraṇakarmadhāraya (*śāstram eva saṃpad*), where the plural indicates the plurality of Śāstras is preferable. The *ādi* probably refers to the creation of diverse objects, which appear simultaneously with knowledge.[21]

verses 25cd–28ab

The construction of *kevalam* in *27d* has not been faithfully adhered to; a literal translation would be: "It [the Śāstra], pervaded by the goddess of the [highest plane] of speech, exists unmingled (*kevalam*) …"

Synonyms for "light" in the sense of the "light of consciousness", like *prabhā* in *25d*, are used to describe the capacity of consciousness to manifest. Being the substrate and content of everything manifest, *prakāśa* can also be translated as "manifestation" in order to emphasize this function.[22] Closely related terms are *avabhāsa* and *ābhāsa*, which are often used as synonyms, but also with the connotations of objectified, manifested light.[23] Perhaps this is just a working hypothesis for those who have problems in accepting too many real synonyms.

In order to explain how scripture can be a direct expression of the reality that is the "light of consciousness", or in the words of the Tantra "the rays of the moon of knowledge", Abhinavagupta states in *25cd–26* that there is no real difference between light, knowledge, consciousness and awareness. Also the appearance of objects is only the appearance of consciousness.[24]

27a contains the main thesis, which we have stated in advance for the sake of clarity, namely that the Śāstras are the direct expression of the "light of consciousness". *27b* means that there is no use for further arguments to prove the main thesis; but it also implies that Śāstra as a means of knowledge is more valid than direct perception and inference. This is the far-reaching implication

---

21 Cf. also: *yā saṃpat saṃpattiḥ siddhiḥ tathātvaprakāśaḥ* … ĪPV 1.1.1, vol. 1, p. 18.

22 Bhāskara glosses *prakāśa* with *prākaṭyam*, "manifestedness", *Bhāskarī* on ĪPV 1.5.11, vol. 1, p. 242.

23 This would at least explain why the *śivatattva* can be described as ultimately without *ābhāsa*. Cf. ĪPV 3.1.1, vol. II, p. 190: *yattadupadeśabhāvanādiṣu tathābhāsamānam anābhāsarūpam api vastutaḥ śivatattvam*.

24 "In this system the persistent existence or non-existence of things without being embedded in consciousness is illogical, for [only] things that are embedded in consciousness appear. And their nature as appearance is their identity with consciousness, for appearance is consciousness." *iha bhāvānāṃ sattvam asattvaṃ vā vyavatiṣṭhamānaṃ saṃvidviśrāntim antareṇa na upapadyate* | *saṃvidviśrāntā hi bhāvāḥ prakāśamānā bhavanti* | *prakāśamānatā ca eṣāṃ saṃvidabheda eva* | *prakāśa eva saṃvid yataḥ* | ĪPVV vol. 1, p. 4–5. Abhinavagupta never shows any trace of modesty, so *iha* [*śāstre*] does not indicate a relativistic position, but simply the beginning of a valid doctrine.

of Abhinavagupta's position: if the knowledge embodied in Śaiva scripture is the direct expression of the highest form of consciousness/Śiva, it must be not only more valid than other instruments of knowledge, but its scope is also not circumscribed by the individual's contracted consciousness. It may therefore reveal to him things to which he has no access otherwise.[25]

The doctrine of the four levels of the word (*vāk*), namely "physical"[26] (*vaikharī*), "intermediate" (*madhyamā*), "visionary" (*paśyantī*) and "highest" (*parā*) need not be discussed here. Abhinavagupta describes the increasing duality that appears in speech in terms of a division of the "denoter" and "denoted".[27] This model of the creation of Āgama is alluded to in several places (e.g. *400*ff) in our text.

28ab identifies the plane on which our author wishes to describe the Śāstra, the *parā vāk*. It also shows that the objection does not apply, because the "real Āgama" exists on the highest level of speech and is not the text of a Tantra.[28]

verses 28cd–30ab
This is a modified quotation of ĪPK 1.5.10f. The original reads *svāminaś cātmasaṃsthasya bhāvajātasya bhāsanam | asty eva ...prakāśo 'rthoparakto 'pi sphaṭikādijaḍopamaḥ.*[29]

The passage quoted here in response to the question in *24cd–25ab* is the *locus classicus* for the definition of *vimarśa* and shows that Utpaladeva has already treated the same problem: it is his position that objects appear outside without their nature as consciousness being impaired, that is, the objects remain within the "I" whose real nature is unaffected.[30] But – asks Abhinavagupta in

25 *na hi pratyakṣaṃ māyāpramātuḥ sarvatra kramate, anumānam apy evaṃ, na hi yad yad asti tatra tatra liṅgavyāptyādigrahaṇasaṃbhavaḥ | āgamas tv aparicchinnaprakāśātmakamāheśvaravimarśaparamārthaḥ kiṃ na paśyet*, ĪPV 3.1.1, vol. 2, p. 186. See ĪPVV, vol. 3, p. 84: *tataḥ sa eva vimarśa āgama iti ucyate ...parokṣe ca arthe tasya prāmāṇyam.*

26 According to Kṣemarāja the otherwise unattested *vikhara* means "body". See *Sāmbapañcāśikāṭīkā* on verse 4 (p.4).

27 For a description of the levels of speech the *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa* is one of the most important sources, cf. PTV, p. 4f: *na hi prathamajñānakāle bhedo 'tra asphurat, yatra vācyavācakaviśeṣayor abhedaḥ | madhyamā punas tayor eva vācyavācakayor bhedam ādarśya sāmānādhikaraṇyena vimarśavyāpārā, vaikharī tu tadubhayabhedasphuṭatāmayy eva.* See GNOLI (1985). For more information on the topic, see GNOLI (1959) and PADOUX (1990).

28 See *800cd*: "Āgama is not this collection of texts (*grantha*) in a manuscript" (or: "manuscripts and texts"). *āgamo hi na nāmaiṣa pustakagranthasaṃcayaḥ.*

29 The text of the ĪPK and the Vṛtti thereon is quoted from TORELLA's excellent edition. Although I have used his interpretations throughout, my translation sometimes differs in order to maintain consistency of style and terminology.

30 *bahīrūpatayā ābhāsane 'pi ahantārūpatā na truṭyati*, ĪPV 1.5.10. The text is given as trans-

his introduction to 1.5.11 – the "awareness of will" mentioned in ĪPK 1.5.10, as indeed every form of *vimarśa*, implies differential thought, which, if the first proposition were true, would then exist in consciousness without differentiating it. The solution of the Pratyabhijñā is to conceive *vimarśa* as a function of consciousness itself and to demonstrate that its potential to become differentiated works, as it were, only on the outside.

In one respect consciousness is comparable to things which, because of their clarity, are able to reflect objects, like a crystal, water, a mirror,[31] but the crucial difference is that sentiency, consisting in an awareness or experience of the object, is absent in them.[32]

verses 30cd–33

The text of *30c* in K_{ed} does not make much sense. The Jammu manuscripts provide a better reading for the suspect second *kiṃca*, and the differences between J_1 and J_2 in the last three syllables of the first pāda point to a misreading there. The conjecture "*āmarśa*" accords with the source quoted above, namely Utpaladeva's *Vṛtti* on 1.5.11, which connects *pratyavamarśa* with *camatkāra*.[33]

For the interpretation of this verse it has to be borne in mind that *āmarśa* etc. is often joined to its object and describes a specific "awareness", like the "awareness of an insentient object" (*ghaṭavimarśa*), any internal sensation, as in the verse under discussion, the outside world (*idaṃ*) in general, or the "I" (*aham*).

Taking *31cd* with *32a* does not make good sense. My interpretation of *sphuṭa/susphuṭa* as inwardly/outwardly perceptible rests on the wider context.[34]

The source of the quotation in *32cd–33* is not known and the interpretation remains problematic. For *sādhana* in the sense of *hetu*, see JHALAKĪKAR (1978), s.v., no. 1.

verses 34–35

The "first emission" had been mentioned in *18d* as the highest "face", i.e. the

---

mitted with the commentary *Bhāskarī*, the KSTS reads *antārūpatayā*.

31 That is Abhinava's interpretation in the *Vimarśinī*: *sphaṭikasalilamakurādiḥ*, vol. 1, p. 198. Abhinavagupta's substitution of *sphaṭika*, "crystal", with *ratna*, "gem", is metrically motivated and does not imply a new meaning.

32 See TORELLA (1994a), p. 118, for Utpaladeva's own commentary.

33 See TORELLA (1994a), p. 118, fn. 23.

34 Cf. ĪPV (1.1.1, vol. 1, p. 18), where *sphuṭatara* is used for describing the appearance of outside objects: *sphuṭatarabhāsamānanīlasukhādi-*.

ultimate source for the knowledge that becomes the Āgama. Here the author is still describing the mechanics of the appearance of the Śāstra in analogy to the phenomenon of cognition.

verses 36–37

upadhi is here used in the sense of *upādhi*.

It seems that it is only for the sake of theory that we have to assume religious practice (*samācāra*[35]) even there. The adjective "extraordinary" emphasizes the same point: whereas in the different layers of the Trika there is either injunction or prohibition of certain practices, this "extraordinary" practice is not defined by a method and a goal (*upāyopeya*); it is a practice that cannot be specified, but is demanded by the structure of the system. Further "down" in the creation of the Śāstra the limitations superimposed on the pure expression of knowledge will result in specific religious practices, but in analogy to the description of an undivided, albeit differentiated reality, the highest Śāstra too cannot be free from all forms of religious practice. This is the result of Abhinava's notion of a supreme all-inclusive non-duality that is not even devoid of duality.

The descent of the Śāstra is accompanied not only by an unavoidable process of abridgment, but also by the creation of non-essential doctrines that are then rejected in the scriptures of greater "essentiality", the genre of *Sāraśāstras*.[36] Here lies an inconsistency in the system which may explain why the beginning of our text is so cautiously abstract. In order to produce non-dualistic Śāstras – which are only conceivable as the antithesis of dualistic doctrines (see below) – the dualistic scriptures have to be created first. But then the sequence will not tally with the present description that starts from the highest reality, in which non-duality prevails, to more differentiated levels. For Abhinavagupta this is not an issue: the state just described is the higher Trika that is really beyond concrete scripture with religious injunction. For the actual definition of the inclusive non-dualism of the Trika he has to wait until the lower levels are created. An adherent of the system would certainly deny the charge of inconsistency, as he would argue that all levels of reality are simultaneously present and that the description of earlier and later does not apply to time, but to ontological planes. For the historian this means that this peculiar non-dualism presupposes a fully blown, and probably influential Siddhānta.

35 The word is used also in *41c*, *290a*, *366a*.

36 One example of such a scripture is the *Vijñānabhairavatantra*, which rejects as provisional the forms of the deity taught in other Trika scriptures. See Sanderson (1990b), p. 74–6.

verses 38–39

The diversity of Śāstras will be explained later as arising through the influence of the five powers, which are identified with Śiva's five faces. Here the word "three" (*39d*) indicates that we are still in the realm of the Trika.

One problem arises with the introduction of a "*vyaktisthāna*". On the level of the comparison one could understand *vyakti* as "reflection" in an object like water, but this is not what Abhinavagupta means. In his doctrine there is no external entity, in which the knowledge could be reflected and differentiated; rather the objects are manifested by the same consciousness that is the source of the Śāstra. To say that in the course of creation and differentiation knowledge is also differentiated means that these processes occur simultaneously and that there is no influence of the lower on the higher. The use of the word *upādhi* in the next verses seems to contradict this, but the issue is clarified in *200cd*ff.

verses 40–41

The monistic model of creation maintained in this system is expressed here in an allegory: Bhairava is the ocean, his "floods" are the "objects". The continuous upsurge of the ocean is compared to Bhairava being in a state of "increase", which is here synonymous with the "swelling up" (*ucchūnatā*) that has to take place before creation can be "poured out" (*visarga*) and is preceded by volition implied in the desiderative. The word *bṛṃhitaḥ* in *40d* prepares the reader for the five *brahman*s mentioned below.

By indicating the possibility of a "slight practice" the author is descending only a little in terms of the hierarchy of cults. The terminology (cf. *visarga*) suggests that we are still dealing with the Kaula.

verses 42–45

tat in *42a* stands for *bhāvāḥ* (*40c*).

In this passage the transition of Śiva being the proprietor of his power to a state of identification with it is described, and this marks the Kaula form of worship. The identification of this emission with "enjoyment" (*bhoga*) in *44* underlines this.[37]

In Abhinavagupta's Trika the "kula method" (*kulaprakriyā*) is a higher and more effective level above the ordinary "tantra method",[38] and is reserved for

---

37 Cf. MVT 19.100–101: *bhuktvā yathepsitān bhogān yāty ante paramaṃ padam | ity ayaṃ kathito leśāt kauliko vidhir uttamaḥ ||100|| yogināṃ sarvasiddhyarthaṃ kulamārgānusāriṇām ||101||*

38 Cf. SANDERSON (1986), fn. 2.

the specially qualified. This "secret" method (*rahasyavidhi*)[39] aims at perceiving all things as essentially a manifestation of Śiva's power and at shedding all inhibitions (*śaṅkā*)[40] produced by birth in a particular social position (*jāti*) etc. The way to this freedom lies in transgressive practices like drinking alcohol,[41] or whatever one thinks fitting.[42]

I cannot quote a definition of the "practice of consciousness" that is mentioned in *45a*, but it is used here to describe what is otherwise called *advaita-* and *vāmācāra*: "For the Trika this distinction between dualism and nondualism was also reflected in ritual and observance. The religious practice of the Siddhānta was dualistic (*dvaitācāraḥ*) in the sense that it accepted the orthodox (Vedic) distinctions between the pure and the impure and remained strictly within the boundaries of the former. The Trika, by contrast, advocated the practice of nonduality (*advaitācāraḥ*) in as much as its rituals involved contact with impure persons and/or substances. [...] this orthopraxy and heteropraxy are characterized in our sources as right (*dakṣiṇa-*) and left (*vāma-*) respectively, where right is that which agrees with orthodox norms and left that which goes against them [...]".[43]

verses 46–47

From TĀ 27.6 we know that the passage is quoted from the *Sarvajñānottaratantra*,[44] which survives in a fragmentary old Nepalese as well as in south-Indian manuscripts.[45] The quotation refers to the Kaula worship, where Śiva

39 Described in TĀ 29, which is based on MVT, chapter 11.

40 Cf. *Tantrāloka* 29.5: *tathātvena samastāni bhāvajātāni paśyataḥ | dhvastaśaṅkāsamūhasya yāgas tādṛśa eva saḥ ||* and Jayaratha's gloss: *tathātveneti śivaśaktisphārasāratayā*.

41 This is in conscious transgression of the rules of purity. See SANDERSON (1995), p. 80, for the legal implications.

42 TĀ 29.6ff. This seems to be an already spiritualized interpretation of the more legalistic injunctions to drink alcohol at every *yāga*. For the quotations adduced by Jayaratha on *Tantrāloka* 29.11–13 betray a different spirit: the drinking of alcohol is a *vidhi*, on the transgression of which expiation is necessary. It is only in emergency (*āpad*) that a more infrequent use of alcohol can be justified, at parva-days or once a month, but after one month without alcohol one becomes an ordinary being (*paśu*). We can conclude that the adherents of the Kula were not libertines, but in some respect guided by the same principles as are the adherents of the Vedic religion: their socio-religious position seems to have been invariably connected with a certain practice (*ācāra*), the non-observance of which must eventually lead to a loss of this status.

43 SANDERSON (1995), p. 17f.

44 See GNOLI (1972), p. 889, for other quotations of this text in the TĀ.

45 See SANDERSON (1992), p. 291. Dominic GOODALL has kindly supplied me with the numbers of the transcript and manuscripts in the École Française d'Extrême Orient, Pondi-

is surrounded by a group of eight "mothers".[46]

In this context we cannot ignore the problematic passage in the PTV, where Abhinavagupta says that the "goddesses of the senses" (*karaṇadevatā*), which are like rays emanating from the sun of Śiva,[47] "are described in the scriptures of the Mata etc. as the retinue of Lord Bhairava."[48]

Immediately preceding this section is a description of another pantheon of five deities that is derived from the Krama: *khecarī, gocarī, dikcarī* and *bhūcarī*, which are emanations of *vyomeśvarī*.[49] Abhinava's treatment is, however, anomalous, because he has to adapt the terminology to the verse of the Tantra he is commenting upon. In his commentary *khecarī* is the highest, of which all others, i.e. *vyomacarī, gocarī, dikcarī,* and *bhūcarī*, are emanations.[50] Provided that we accept the *Paryantapañcāśikā* as a work of Abhinavagupta[51] the following verse from this work would prove that he also accepted the ordinary sequence: "Plunging into the great lake, into the consciousness of the self that is *vyomeśvarī*, who is full of the four *vāha*s, i.e. the streams of *khecarī* etc., one should submerge the insentient world."[52]

What is remarkable in this section of the PTV is that there seems to be a conflation of two pantheons: some of the statements and quotations point to the series of eight mothers,[53] others to the Krama deities already mentioned. I suppose that the ambiguity is deliberately not resolved to suggest that, although the Krama deities are mentioned, our author did not want to follow the Śākta Krama with a purely female pantheon, but integrated it into the Kaula or Mata with Śiva at the centre. He does so by showing structural similarities rather than

---

cherry: T 334, 83, 985, 496, 760 (*Sarvajñānottara*); RE 108716 (*Sarvajñānottara*, Jñāna- and Yogapāda), 47852/47818/47828 *Sarvajñānottaravṛtti* of Aghoraśiva.

46 Brāhmī, Māheśvarī, Kaumarī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhī, Indrāṇī and Cāmuṇḍā. Cf. TĀ 8.241cd–242 with Jayaratha's *Viveka*.

47 *śivārkasya dīdhitirūpāḥ*. PTV p. 42.

48 *tā [karaṇadevatā] uktā matādiśāstreṣu bhagavadbhairavabhaṭṭārakaparivārabhūtāḥ |* PTV p. 42. For details and references, see GNOLI (1985), p. 287–289.

49 See *Mahānayaprakāśa* 3.117: *prathamapratibhārūpā vyomeśī seyam ucyate | khecaryādisvarūpaṃ yat tad asyā eva jṛmbhitam ||*.

50 As *vyoman* and *kha* can be used as synonyms the reversal is not too problematic.

51 The editor RAGHAVAN does not question the attribution on the strength of the *Gurunāthaparāmarśa*, but the work bears no formal imprint of our author such as an allusion to his teachers, the mention of his name and the like. This might not weigh much for a small work, but in the case of an author who even dated Stotras, some suspicion is appropriate.

52 *khecaryādicatuḥsrotovāhapūrṇāṃ mahāhradam | vyomeśvarīm ātmacitiṃ vigāhya broḍayej jaḍam ||23||*

53 The passage quoted above mentioning Śiva's *parivāraḥ* and the quotation from the *Mālinītantra* in *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, p. 43.

by trying to connect unequal numbers: the set of Krama deities are described on a psychological level as personifications of deluding states of mind like "lust", "anger" etc.[54] This "inequality" of the states of mind is *saṃsāra* and therefore nothing but an ignorance of reality. The Kaula set of deities can be described in very similar terms: their activity binds the soul even closer to *saṃsāra* as long as their true nature remains unrecognized; if recognized, they grant liberation in life.[55]

The same passage from the *Sarvajñānottara* is quoted in TĀ 27.6 in a different context,[56] but pointing to a similar interpretation. There the use of mantras from the "higher" scriptures in the installation of outer idols is forbidden, because these mantras can only grant perfection (*siddhi*), if they are used secretly and internally; outside they might be even dangerous. This is explained by Śiva's lust for enjoyment and by alluding to the negative consequences for the worshipper, who fails to comply with it;[57] the same quotation from the *Sarvajñānottara* is then adduced as a scriptural support. Here the desire for enjoyment, which is more readily connected with ferocious deities,[58] is projected onto Śiva. In the *Vārttika* the quotation has been adduced for similar reasons; the concept of enjoyment as a source of liberation, which was mentioned in *45*, is explained in an admittedly oblique way through the quotation: if the desire of the deities is gratified through enjoyment, they grant perfection, or liberation.[59]

---

54 *saiva khecarī kāmakrodhādirūpatayā vaiṣamyena lakṣyate* | PTV, p. 40.

55 *aparijñātasvarūpāś …sāṃsārikapāśyapaśubhāvadāyinyaḥ | …jñātasvarūpās tā evoktayuktyā jīvanmuktatāpradāyinyaḥ* | PTV, p. 43f. This might have been the inspiration for *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya*, Sūtra 12 and 13, which also connects both pantheons. The proximity of both sets of deities is also indicated in the anonymous quotation in TĀV on 29.16.

56 *uktaṃ jñānottarāyāṃ ca tad etat parameśinā | śivo yāgapriyo yasmād viśeṣān mātṛmadhyagaḥ ||*

57 Cf. TĀ 27.4–5.

58 They are described as "desiring to devour" (Lit.: "lick") (*lelihāna* glossed as *bhoktum ekāgra* by Śivopādhyāya, see below), for instance in *Mahānayaprakāśa* (TSS) 7.142: *tato 'pi vāsanārūpapuryaṣṭakavilāpanāt | mahāvilayarūpatvāl lelihāneti kathyate* ||. The word occurs in *Vijñānabhairavatantra* 77b, interestingly in a metrically wrong passage (bha-vipula without a preceding ra) and is, together with *rerihāṇa* attested as a name of Śiva. Harunaga Isaacson informs me that *rerihāṇa*, which is known to the dictionaries only from lexicography, actually occurs in the Ur-*Skandapurāṇa* (14.19c) being edited at present by ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER and ISAACSON.

59 We can distinguish many aspects of this structure, a ritual one ("outside" deities are gratified by forbidden substances), a gnostic one (their nature is recognized), and one of internal ritual (inner experiences *are* the offering) which forms the bridge between the other two.

verses 48–49

I took the construction *-viyojane …upāśrite* as a dual. The other possibility would be the locative of a *samāhāra-dvandva*.

The two verses sum up the creation of the Śāstra in order to answer the question raised in *24cd–25ab*. As the differentiation inside consciousness becomes more complex, the expression of knowledge is objectified as the Śāstra and descends finally to the lowest level of human speech. Thus knowledge is reduced to differentiated doctrine that eventually crystalizes in a text. The formulation of this process sounds rather complicated and the reason for this is probably an interpretational inconsistency: in order to maintain his monistic standpoint the author has to disguise the more straightforward doctrine that the knowledge "that has its source in the lotus of Śiva's face, though one, becomes manifolds, as it resorts to objects."[60] This model works in the Siddhānta, where the world and Śiva are divided, but it has to be reinterpreted, if the Śāstra and the world are created by the same process, if, in other words, Śiva is the direct source of the limitation.

60 *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, vidyāpāda 1.3.

Section 5
The Five Powers

Up to this point the author, by mentioning only three powers, had suggested that he was dealing with levels within the Trika. Applied to the hierarchy of the Śāstra the introduction of the five powers of Śiva marks the transition to the theological realm dominated by the Siddhānta. As explained in the introduction, the pentad of faces or mantras is a pan-Śaiva doctrine used in the Siddhānta for the legitimation of its own hierarchy of the Āgamic canon.[1] The Trika-Śaivas could not alter this structure without coming into contradiction with scripture itself, but the aim was never to render the Siddhānta completely invalid; to remain in control of the whole Śaiva revelation it was crucial to include it as a lower level. The most natural solution was therefore to find a scriptural passage that would back up the claim for an extension of the fivefold structure (*160*) and to demonstrate that the pentad is only a further differentiation of the Trika (*393*).

verses 50–51

It is interesting to note that the pentad of powers is deduced from this less than obvious passage in the MVT, because our author, despite all claims that "everything is in the *Mālinī*", does not slavishly adhere to this Tantra for quotations, and the same doctrine could probably have been obtained more easily from elsewhere. If this is not just accidental we ought to conclude that Abhinavagupta wanted to demonstrate that the scope of the *Mālinī* was not limited to the higher levels only, but was capable of including also the pentadic structure of the Siddhānta's Sadāśivamūrti.

The pun with *prapañca/pañca* is probably the reason for the inverted position of some of the words in this quotation. The text of the original runs as follows:[2]

---

1 That this pentadic structure is Siddhānta-orientated is proven by the fact that the upper face (Īśāna) is reserved for the Siddhānta Āgamas. See Introduction for details.

2 This is quoted from Somdev VASUDEVA's forthcoming edition of the text. GNOLI reads -*patyena* for -*patvena* in his translation of the MVT and the TĀ (GNOLI (1972), p. 355 and p. 791) (= J_1's reading), but this must be just a misprint. The transmission of the text of

savyāpārādhipatvena taddhīnaprerakatvataḥ ||2.34||
icchānivṛtteḥ svasthatvād abhinnam api pañcadhā |
iti pañcātmake bhede vijñeyaṃ vastu kīrtitam ||2.35||

It is also quoted in the *Tantrāloka* 10.185 for a different pentadic structure:

> [Commentary] "If each one of the lower forms merges into the preceding, it would give up its own nature. As a consequence there would not be any place for the fifteen[fold nature of the perceiving subjects up to *mantra-maheśvaraḥ*]. To this objection he replies:
> [TĀ] This has been prescribed by the Creator in the *Śrīpūrva*[śāstra, i.e. MVT],[3] for he proclaims that the nature of the states of waking etc. correspond to his being equipped with activity (*vyāpāra-*), with sovereignty (*adhipatvam*) etc. Although Śiva is undivided, [this division] is due to his subtle inner knowledge.[4]

In his commentary, Jayaratha quotes the full verse from the MVT and indicates a correlation between the five states of consciousness and the five principal powers:[5]

MVT	*śaktiḥ*	*avasthā*
savyāpāra-	kriyā	jāgarā
adhipatvena	jñānam	svapnaḥ
taddhīnaprerakatvataḥ	icchā	sauṣuptam
icchānivṛtteḥ	ānandaḥ	turyam
svasthatvād	cit	turyātītam

As we shall see later, other pentads could be added to this structure.

---

the MVT and the TĀ is unambiguous and only the *-tva*, which governs both parts of the compound, can be correct.

3 Opinions as to how the compound *śrīpūrva* is to be understood vary: the "glorious first", or "one whose name starts with *śrī*".

4 *nanv adharādhararūpaṃ pūrvasmin pūrvasmin rūpe nilīnaṃ sat svarūpam eva jahyād iti, tatrāsya niravakāśaiva pāñcadaśyādiśaṅketyāśaṅkyāha "etat ca sūtritaṃ dhātrā śrīpūrve yad bravīti hi* | *savyāpārādhipatvenetyādinā jāgradāditām* ||10.185|| *abhinne 'pi śive 'ntaḥsthasūkṣmabodhānusārataḥ* |"

5 *ity atra śivasya savyāpāratvena kriyāśaktipradhānā jāgarā* | *adhipatvena svasvātantryād asādhāraṇatattatsṛṣṭimayo jñānaśaktipradhānaḥ svapnaḥ* | *jñānakriyābhyāṃ hīnenaud-āsīnyapracyāvātmanā prerakatvenecchāpradhānaṃ sauṣuptaṃ* | *eṣaṇīyapūrṇatayā tan-nivṛttyāpy ānandaśaktipradhānaṃ turyam* | *nirānandatayā sarvasarvātmakaparipūrṇasva-rūpaviśrānteś cicchaktipradhānaṃ turyātītam iti pañcāvasthātmakatvam ity arthaḥ* |

5.1 The Nature of Time

The question in *52* provokes a long digression on the relation of manifestation, cognition and time. The author tries to come back to the main topic in *125* but succeeds not before *133*.

One of the important points of Abhinavagupta's doctrine is what we could call a gradual transition from nonduality to duality. To indicate the intermediate (*bhedābheda*) state, the term "differentiation" has been used instead of "division". Simplifying the matter slightly one might say that "differentiation", which does not entail duality, is a process inside consciousness, whereas duality entails a projection of the already differentiated content to the outside.

At this point in the discussion we are still in the intermediate state[6] and the pentadic structure is therefore without the corollaries of duality like time and space. This is, however, difficult to believe for the opponent, who counters by eliciting a clear statement from our author. Abhinavagupta can only agree and is then confronted with the fact that he has already used divisions of time.

verse 53

For the identification of the deity Kālī with time, see TĀ 6.7:

> [Commentary] If the whole universe appears only as merged in consciousness, as its appearance cannot otherwise come about, there is – because of its eternity – no connection of consciousness with time. How can on the other hand [be explained that time is connected] to a group of things which is inseparable from it [consciousness]. To this he responds:
> [TĀ] In its highest form[7] time, being of the nature of sequence and non-sequence, resides in consciousness. It is called *kālī* and is the highest power of God.[8]

---

6 Verse *49* was an exception, a leap forward to duality in order to answer the introductory question.

7 GNOLI proposes to read *sarvaḥ* with one manuscript for *paraḥ*, but I tend to think that Abhinavagupta, while identifying Kālī with the highest power wants to make the point that this form of time is not equivalent to the *tattva* of the same name, and have therefore retained *paraḥ*.

8 *nanu sarvam idaṃ jagat saṃvillagnam evāvabhāsate 'nyathā hy asya bhānam eva na bhavet, saṃvidi ca nityatvāt kālayogo nāsti, iti katham asau tadanuṣaktasya bhāvajātasyāpi syāt* | *ity āśaṅkyāha "kramākramātmā kālaś ca paraḥ saṃvidi vartate* | [...] *kālī nāma parā śaktiḥ saiva devasya gīyate* ||7||"

verse 54
Cf. *tatra ca idam evam atra idānīm ityādibhedakalanā na kācit* PTV, p.5. "There [in the first moment] the construction of division as [evident in] 'this', 'so', 'here', 'now' etc. is absent."

After forcing the author to admit this problematic point, the *pūrvapakṣa* has no difficulties in showing that the differentiation inherent in this account of the evolution of the *Śāstra* had presupposed the concept of time from the very beginning. In the first verse of the commentary itself (*15c*) he has used *prāk* to describe the highest state, in *19c* he refers to a future division, etc.

verses 55–57
samaśīrṣikā is attested in *Rājataraṅginī* 3.135 and means "Gleichstellung" according to the PW.

nīlaṃ saroruham needs some explanation. Following the more usual sense of the word we would have to translate: a "blue lotus".[9] Ratnākaraśānti, while commenting on the word *nīlapaṅkaja* in *Hevajratantra* 1.3.7, says even more bluntly: *paṅkajam utpalam.*[10] In fact blue lotusses are known only to poetic imagination,[11] but a fictitious poetic convention would not serve the argument in our text. It might be argued that to the mediaeval Indian mind poetic conventions were not unreal,[12] but in our case the solution is, I think, much easier. There is a definition in the *Amarakośa*, perhaps not used too often by classical authors, which gives *nīlāmbujanma* as a name of the blue water-lily (*nīlotpalam*).[13] In other words *ambujanma*, and probably also other words formed by synonyms (*ambhoja, saroja* etc.), can exceptionally be used

---

9 One might argue that the etymological meaning of *saroruha* could accommodate all sorts of aquatic plants, but the meaning established by usage (*rūḍhi*) is that of a lotus (*Nelumbo nucifera gaertneri*) and not of a water-lily (*Nymphea stellata* etc.). See RAU (1954).

10 Quoted from a draft edition of the text by Harunaga ISAACSON.

11 Thus RAU (1954). In SYED (1990) ROXBURGH is quoted, who says he has not come across a blue Nelumbio in "these parts of Asia", but that it is said to be a native of Persia etc.

12 Rājaśekhara states that poetical conventions are not untrue, but facts from a different time or of remote places, which entered the language through the old masters who travelled the world. *pūrve hi vidvāṃsaḥ sahasraśākhaṃ sāṅgaṃ ca vedam avagāhya, śāstrāṇi cāvabudhya, deśāntarāṇi dvīpāntarāṇi ca paribhramya, yān arthān upalabhya praṇītavantas teṣāṃ deśakālāntaravaśenānyathātve 'pi tathātvenopanibandho yaḥ sa kavisamayaḥ* | (*Kāvyamīmāṃsā*, p. 78.).

13 *syād utpalaṃ kuvalayam atha nīlāmbujanma ca* | *indīvaraṃ ca nīle 'smin site kumudakairave*, *Amarakośa*, Vārivarga, vs. 37. "*kuvalaya* is a water-lily of any colour (*utpala*). *nīlāmbujanma* as well as *indīvara* are used for the blue [variety], *kumuda* and *kairava* for the white [variety]".

for "blue water-lily", if the colour is stated to be blue.[14] The logic behind this could indeed be the fact that no blue lotus exists in nature and that therefore no ambiguity can arise.[15]

5.2 Light as Knowledge

This passage is preliminary to the discussion of time that follows in the next section.

verses 58–59
The translation of *prasāda* in *58d* is confirmed by the similar phrase (*prakāśānugraha*) in ĪPV 1.5.2 (vol. 1, p. 155).

In other words, if a cognition different from the light of consciousness would be required to know the light, then this knowledge would imply a light different from the first one to become manifest, and so on. It follows that one has to assume identity of light and cognition in order to prevent the logical fault of infinite regress.

verse 60
The similar *aprathātmakam* occurs in TĀ 1.26, where ignorance is defined not as the absence of knowledge, but as incomplete knowledge: "Therefore a knowledge that does not consist of the complete manifestation of a reality to be known, is ignorance [...]."[16] In combination with *-ātma-* the *ka*-suffix in *60c* does not modify the meaning (*svārthe*) and I assume the same for the one in *aprathamānakam*.

The verse under discussion contains a succinct allusion to the discussion of perceptibility in the Trika, which is a response to the Mīmāṃsaka doctrine of "manifestedness" (*prakaṭatā*) understood as a quality of objects.[17] An extensive treatment of this controversy is given in the chapter on *vastudharma* in

---

14 SYED assumes a "rare blue lotus" to avoid contradiction, but her source for the identification is, as far as I can see, the *Śabdakalpadruma*, which mentions *nīlāmbujanma* as a synonym for *indīvara*. As we have seen, this does not mean that *indīvara* can come to mean "blue lotus", but that *nīlāmbujanma* can irregularly be used for "blue water-lily". See SYED (1990), p. 624.

15 This observation can perhaps reconcile us with Indian poetry, whose lack of natural realism RAU laments in his famous article on lotusses.

16 *ato jñeyasya tattvasya sāmastyenāprathātmakam | jñānam eva tad ajñānaṃ* [...]

17 Jayaratha identifies the opponent's side as *kaumārilaṃ matam* (TĀV 10.21) and *śābaramata* (TĀV 10.57). According to him, there is a difference between the two sub-schools

TĀ 10.19ff and ĪPV on 1.5.2, where Utpaladeva had stated that the object, in order to be perceptible, must consist of light. But it is not possible to account for the process of sensory perception only by supposing a "light in the object", i.e. the object's manifestedness, because then all objects would be manifest to everyone all the time. Abhinavagupta brings out this criticism levelled at the Kṣaṇikavādins and the Mīmāṃsakās by Utpala[18] and says:

> The same fault is to be found in the [Mīmāṃsaka] doctrine of 'manifestedness': if [as in their doctrine] the light is completely merged with the body of the object, then the existence of light as connected to the perceiver, as in [the perception] 'the light is manifest *to me*', is difficult to account for.[19]

Needless to say, this is not fair to the Mīmāṃsaka theory of perception, which, at least in sophisticated accounts, supposes two 'lights', one inside and one outside, i.e. belonging to the perceived objects themselves, both of which meet in the process of perception.[20]

---

on the following point: the Kaumārilas hold that 'manifestedness' resides in the object, for the Prābhākaras it resides in the conscious subject (*prakaṭatārthagateti kaumārilāḥ | saṃvitpramātṛgateti prabhākarāḥ*, TĀV 10.58ab).

18 See TORELLA (1994a), p. 112: "In formulating the Śaiva position, Utp. is implicitly critical particularly of the Buddhist and Kumārila thesis ... For Kumārila, on the contrary, an added quality, 'being manifest' (*prakaṭatā*) occurs in the object, from whose presence a former cognitive act is inferred. In both cases the light is not separate – as Utp. also maintains – but it is found, so to speak, completely resolved within the object [...] According to Utp. there is an illumination of the thing (whose essence is light) by the light of the subject."

19 *prakaṭatāvāde 'pi ayam eva doṣaḥ, sarvathā arthaśarīraviśrāntaḥ cet prakāśo mama avabhāsate iti pramātṛlagnatayā prakāśasthitiḥ durupapādā*, ĪPV 1.5.2 (vol. 1, p. 155f).

20 Cf. *Mānameyodaya*, p. 10f.: "*cakṣur nāma kanīnikāntargataṃ tejo* ..." *atra cakṣuḥśrotrayoḥ prāpyakāritve vivādo 'stīti tayor api bahirindriyatvāt tvagādivat prāpyakāritvaṃ sādhanīyam | tataś ca cakṣuṣaḥ pṛthutarapṛthivīdharādidarśanāt pṛthvagratvam api tejaḥsvabhāvasiddham āśrayaṇīyam | tathā unmīlanakṣaṇa eva dūrataraśanaiścarādidarśanād vyāpyāvasthitena bāhyatejasā nirgamanasamaya evaikībhāvaḥ kalpanīyaḥ | na ca bāhyatejasaḥ sakalavyāpitvāt keralebhyo 'pi gaṅgādarśanaprasaṅgaḥ | adṛṣṭopagṛhītenaivālokabhāgenaikībhāvāt |*

"Here, in the case of the eye and the ear, there is a difference of view in regard to functioning by reaching to the object. So, they too being external senses, like the sense of touch, etc. it has to be made out that they too function by reaching the object. And again, since the sense of sight perceives mountains, etc. which are much larger, we have to acknowledge for it, an extended field of light at the end, which is made out as the nature of light. Similarly, since just at the moment of opening the eyes, Saturn and other very distant objects are perceived, it has to be assumed to become one with the pervasive external light, even at the moment of coming out. Nor does there result the possibility of seeing the Gaṅgā from Kerala for the reason that the external light is all-pervasive; because, it becomes one only with that part of the light which is taken hold of by some unseen potentiality." (Raja and Sastri's translation)

The discussion in the Tantrāloka is too long-winded to be reported here,[21] but the outcome is a deconstruction of the subject and object of knowledge: on the outside there are no real objects, only a manifestation of light which is identical with consciousness, and on the inside "there is no definite subject in the act of knowledge …" (67cd).

5.3 The Nature of the Light of Consciousness

verses 61–62ab
This sums up the discussion of time and states why even objects cannot be divided by time. The reason is the identity of everything with light which is described in the next section. As *84* will show this is a further argument to tackle the question on time (*54*).

verses 62cd–63
This is part of the solution for the problem of omniscience in the Pratyabhijñā: there is no external light that is responsible for manifestation, but only a light of the subject that manifests objects. Further arguments will follow in *70cd–74*.

verse 64
See *631* for this suspected use of *śaraṇa* for "[doctrinal] refuge".

Cf. ĪPV 1.5.2, vol. 1, p. 155 (*iti andhatā jagataḥ*), for the metaphor of darkness.

verses 65–66ab
Here another argument is adduced for the identity of objects with light and the logical impossibility of the object being anything else by nature. In other words, the object, its manifestation and its knowledge cannot be distinguished.[22]

In the *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* Kṣemarāja quotes a line from one of his own, otherwise unknown Stotra:

---

21 It deals, for example, with the interpretation of the phrase "object-light" (*arthaprakāśa*), namely whether it should be understood as a subjective or objective genitive, with a causative meaning, whether a metaphorical meaning is involved here, under which circumstances metaphors can be used at all, etc.

22 See TORELLA (1994a), p. 111, note 5, on the Buddhist doctrine of *sahopalambhaniyama* as the background for this concept.

> If non-appearance does not appear, only appearance remains. [But even] if it does, only appearance remains, as [an appearing non-appearance] is of the nature of appearance.[23]

verses 66cd–68ab
The *pūrvapakṣa* maintains that this theory of manifestation as the concrete universal does not exclude the possibility that an object could exist in an unmanifested state prior to its appearance. The light would then only add objectivity to a preexisting object. In this context the phrase in *67a* means: "This is a theoretically valid position".

verses 68cd–70ab
Here light or manifestation is identified with Śiva in the sense that Śiva is the reality of everything that appears. This is not just the religious background of a philosophical concept; the description of his "inconceivable power" also tries to silence all questions about the mechanics of the process of manifestation: his "movement" is a playful manifestation of diversity. *ghūrṇi*, literally "staggering", is a technical term derived from the *Mālinī* for describing one of the five stages in body-centred meditation. During this meditation one who is about to enter the reality of consciousness perceives a kind of bliss (*ānanda*), due to contact with the plenitude of consciousness. Then there is the phenomenon of internal "sudden ascension" (*udbhava*), "trembling" (*kampa*) and finally "sleep" (*nidrā*), which lasts until one enters consciousness itself. The actual realization of the plenitude of consciousness is marked by "reeling" or "staggering" (*ghūrṇi*), as one is no more aware of the body as belonging to the I, but of everything as being included in consciousness.[24] In the same passage Jayaratha connects the word *ghūrṇi* to the vibration of consciousness (*spanda*) and in *69d* this is probably what is meant by *ghūrṇi*. But the choice of words could also be seen as an attempt to identify the sober philosophy of manifestation with the sensuality of a Kaula deity. In order to emphasize this aspect we might translate the compound *svātantryoddāmaghūrṇitaḥ* as "intoxicated (*uddāma*) with his autonomy and [therefore] staggering".

verses 70cd–74
If Śiva manifests as all reality, then it could be argued that his omniscience

23 *akhyātir yadi na khyāti khyātir evāvaśiṣyate \ khyāti cet khyātirūpatvāt khyātir evāvaśiṣyate *, *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya*, Sūtra 4, p. 10. The verb *khyā* suggests the identity between "appearance" and "knowledge".

24 See TĀ 5.100cd–108ab.

should also be present in manifestation. This is, however, disproved by ordinary experience, where we see a diversity of knowledge. The problem is related to the argument on "manifestedness" and omniscience.[25]

A variety of these so-called 'reflections', or articulations of awareness (*vimarśa*) are then quoted[26] with the intention of showing that manifestation and the corresponding knowledge can be differentiated into time, subject and object, or can be completely undifferentiated up to the point, where subject and object are identical and form only one reality. The point of *73c* is of course that the light of manifestation is necessary even for the Buddhist in order to speculate on the self's non-existence.

verses 75–76

I suggest splitting the sentence with the caesura and taking *kaś cit* with *eka*. The translation "single thing" for the masculine pronoun may seem odd at first sight, but the *ekaḥ* is used together with *asaḥ*.

It seems that the opponent has not yet accepted the idea that the "light" is able to project contents and that categories like subject, object, time etc. are no more than such contents. The question refers to the "reflections" mentioned in the preceding passage, which seem to entail a division of light into subjective and objective. He probably means to say that if there is a subjective light which is not aware of an objective light (as in "I, Caitra, do not perceive the cloth"), there cannot be just *one* light.

The reader who has reached this point is relieved by a piece of realistic classroom dialogue. It seems that Abhinava never misses an opportunity to lament the stubbornness of his disciple, who is still not willing to relinquish his "materialistic" interpretation of "light" in favour of the all-inclusive, mystical Śiva-light.

verses 77–78

The opponent tries to show that this theory of *one* light is untenable, as the diversity of things could not be accounted for: the difference between objects would become blurred.

The main line of argumentation adopted by the opponent in *78cd* is a reassertion of the concretistic interpretation of *prakāśa*: there cannot be just one

---

25 See commentary on *60*.

26 There is no indication in the original of how to split the single statements. My attempt is perhaps not the only way, but lends some logic to the sequence. In *71c* one could consider reading *paṭam* (suggested by TORELLA). *iti* in *71d* seems to mark the beginning of a new set of 'reflections' modified by time.

light, even with a multiple nature, if separate objects are manifested. Our author phrases a similar objection in the ĪPV: "If everything manifests only through the nature of pure light, then everything would manifest at the same time and the light of a pot would be [identical with] the light of a cloth. In this way nothing would be distinct."[27]

verse 79
For the phrase *vāgjālaḍambaraḥ*, cf. PTV, p. 38: *iti kim apareṇa vāgjālena*.

The verse could answer the objection to the unity of light in two ways. (a) The light can be only one, as it resides in the one self. (b) The individuality of perception is secured by the fact that the light is received by the intellect (*buddhi*) of the individual. In the second interpretation *svātma* does not mean "the one self", but "one's own self".

verse 80
This verse is identical with the author's *Bodhapañcadaśikā* 8. It sums up the discussion on the nature of *prakāśa* by defining the "inert", the objects, which seem different from light, as delimited light. Knowledge or consciousness is, so to speak, the same substance, but without limitations.

verse 81
In other words, once it is understood that it is the nature of light to become manifest, there is no point in discussing the "light of the objects".

verse 82
An even more dramatic attempt to avoid further objections. The second line could also mean: "are like protecting the chastity of a woman who had sexual relationships with everyone".

verse 83
Although the main idea in this sentence – namely to proclaim light as the fundamental reality, which makes even our doubts about it possible and without which even "darkness" could not be grasped – is not in doubt, the word division is intricate. Each *kiṃ* (except in *kiṃcid*) has to be taken as an interrogative particle and *83c* has to be read as one sentence.

---

27 *sa ca prakāśamātrasvabhāvatvenaiva yadi viśvasya prakāśaḥ, tarhi viśvaṃ yugapad eva prakāśeta, ghaṭaprakāśo 'pi paṭaprakāśaḥ syāt – iti viśvaṃ saṃkīryeta* |, ĪPV 1.2.8, vol. 1, p. 74.

verse 84
As so often in this compact style, the compound in *84ab* has been understood as an adjective supplying the cause (*hetau viśeṣaṇam*). The "even" emphasizes the point made above in the definition of the "inert" and the "conscious": in the unstructured subjective consciousness an influence of time is out of the question, but *even* in the solidified light of objective reality time has no hold.

If *labdha* is correct here, it is used in a loose sense, because Bhairava does not "acquire" identity with the light.

verse 85
hanta could describe a variety of emotions in a heated debate, but here it is either a disciple in despair or an opponent in exasperation.[28] The opponent had raised the same question in verse *54* and is still not convinced.

nirbhajya, from the verbal root *nirbhañj*, means "by breaking it up into pieces".

verse 86
GNOLI translates this verse as follows: "L'unica cosa che esiste è la luce che si manifesta sotto forma di tutte le cose. Questa luce non appartiene a nessuna entit... da essa distinta ma solo essa esiste."[29] I would suggest that *86c* summarizes the position that there is no object to be illumined.

verse 87
This verse recapitulates the active aspect of the light by according it an autonomous will. It is also an attempt to join the main discussion, which we had left shortly after introducing the fivefold structure of the universe (*50–51*). Having dealt with objections concerning time and a discussion of the nature of *prakāśa*, we now proceed to an identification of the fivefold structure with the five powers of Śiva starting with the *icchāśakti*.

verse 88
This definition of *ānanda* introduces another aspect of the autonomy of the light. As there is nothing different from it, it can only rest in its own nature, and this is at the same time the definition of the bliss of God.

At this point, however, bliss is only described as one of Śiva's powers. There are different forms of bliss in Abhinavagupta's Trika, defined as stages of rest

28 *hanta* is glossed by Jayaratha with *sākrośam (upadiśati)*, TĀV 35.7.

29 Verses *86–93* are translated in GNOLI (1979), p. 56f

(*viśrānti*) in different forms of the life energy (*prāṇa*, *apāna*, etc.), and as correlating to other states of consciousness, like waking, sleep etc. and the signs of body-centred meditation (see *68ab–70*).

The word *jagadānanda* is mentioned in MVT 1.1 and eventually leads to a discussion of the stages of bliss in the second Kāṇḍa of the MVV (*20–40*).[30]

verse 89

This verse which describes again *svātantrya/icchā* may appear to be repetitious, but it introduces the aspect of manifestation (*bhāsana*) that is needed for the definition of *kriyā* in the following verse.

verses 90–91

I suspect that the feminine *bhāsanā* is used deliberately, in order to emphasize the aspect of power, and take it to be an otherwise unattested variant for *bhāsanam*.

One important sense of *kalanā* is "differentiation".[31] But my translation follows the exegesis of the root in the sense of projecting (*kala kṣepe*) given in TĀ 4.174a: " 'projection' means the division of one's own self."(*svātmano bhedanaṃ kṣepo*)[32] The sense of the verb *pravibhaj*, "to divide" or "to separate" emphasizes this meaning of *kalanā* and is therefore implied in the translation of *kalanā*. To be more literal ("through which the self-differentiation … is separated") would indicate two processes, a self-differentiation and its separation, but I cannot see how this could be intended here. It is true that there is a differentiation and a projection to the outside, but *pravibhaj* does not yield this sense.

verse 92

The suffix *-taḥ* in *svātmamātrataḥ* is interpreted as a locative, following the rule *sārvavibhaktikas tasi*.[33] One might dismiss this as an artificial exegetical device used only in technical literature, but it is used too often to be ignored.[34]

unmeṣa, literally "opening the eyes", is another word which might just

---

30 See the parallel in TĀ 5.44ff. Cf. also *Bṛhadvimarśinī*, vol. II, p. 177 (line 21)–179.

31 *kalanā paricchittiḥ*, TĀV 6.6.

32 See SANDERSON (1995), p. 64.

33 See also ABHYANKAR AND SHUKLA (1986), s.v. *tasi*.

34 See for instance *Bālakrīḍā* on *Yajñavalkyasmṛti* 1.10 (*tṛtīyārthe pañcamī draṣṭavyā*), also TĀ 1.173ab. For a conscious use of *tasi* in the sense of the locative, see *Spandanirṇaya*, Introductory verse 2: *spandāmṛte carvite 'pi spandasaṃdoha**to** manāk | pūrṇas taccarvaṇābhogodyoga eṣa mayāśritaḥ* ||

mean "become manifest", but it is used here in a specific technical sense. The following two passages define the word: (1) in *Spandakārikā* 2.8 it is that which destroys ignorance,[35] further defined as the space between two thoughts in the context of meditation.[36] (2) *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* 3.1.3: "Īśvara is opening outwards (*unmeṣa*), Sadāśiva is closing inwards (*nimeṣa*)".[37] Here *īśvaratattva* is defined as externality, the predominance of 'this', and *sadāśivatattva* as the predominance of 'I', internality. Abhinavagupta's interpretation in the *Vimarśinī* starts with a quotation of *Spandakārikā* 1.1 thereby disclosing the source for the idea: " 'He whose opening out is the origin of the universe' – in this quotation the *īśvaratattva* is called opening out (*unmeṣa*)."[38] As so often, his quotation is not literal, as the sentence is split into two parts. A literal quotation of *Spandakārikā* can be found in the treatment of the same passage in the ĪPVV (vol. III, p. 266).

The present context is, however, more complicated. From what precedes it seems that we are redefining the full set of five powers, normally called *cit, ānanda, icchā, jñāna, kriyā* as aspects of the process of manifestation. The list in our passage is out of order: *icchā* (*87c*), *ānanda* (*88d*), *kriyā* (*90a*), *jñāna* (*91d*), but the strong conclusion in *92d* forces us in the present context to put *unmeṣa* in the place of *cid*, even if it is clearly used for *ānanda* in *197c* in a closely related context!

5.4 The Number of Powers

verse 93

The next two verses form a justification of the validity of differing pantheons, i.e. of a central Śiva with varying numbers of *śakti*s, or even with a female deity alone. The last idea was certainly seen as suspicious for the Śaiva mainstream, and the *Sāraśāstra* had to be adduced as a scriptural testimony for a purely Śākta pantheon.

A more detailed gradation of powers is given in TĀ 1.110f:

> [TĀ:] The lonely hero, the pair, with three powers, fourfold, as with five forms, sixfold, sevenfold and adorned with a group of eight [...]

---

35 Cf. also *ajñānasya ca unmeṣeṇa vilopaḥ* PTV, p. 112; TĀ 3.74ab.

36 See DYCZKOWSKI (1992), p. 250.

37 *īśvaro bahirunmeṣo nimeṣo 'ntaḥ sadāśivaḥ*. The translation is TORELLA's, see also his notes on the verse (TORELLA (1994a), p. 190f).

38 *yasyonmeṣād udayo jagataḥ – ity atra īśvaratattvam evonmeṣaśabdenoktam* |

[Commentary:] He is "the lonely hero" [i.e. Śiva alone] in the first meditation of the *Netratantra*, "paired" in the same [text]. In the *Kula* method there are the three powers Parā [, Aparā] and [Parāparā]. "Fourfold" [means] divided into Jayā, [Vijayā, Jayantī] and [Aparājitā].[39] "With five forms" [means divided] into Sadyojāta etc.
This is taught [in scripture] that:
'In the Siddhānta the pentad is the essence, the quaternary in the left and right [stream], but the trinity in the Bhairavatantra ...'[40]

In TĀ 1.111 and commentary the sets of deities for the numbers up to twelve are given and even a thousandfold pantheon (according to Jayaratha in the *Triśirobhairava*) and an innumerable number of powers.

The conjecture "*Sāraśāstra*", proposed by SANDERSON, is based on the quotation of a line from this text in the ĪPV.[41] Here *Sāraśāstra* stands for the lost *Trikasāra*,[42] but the term is also used in a wider sense for the genre of "quintessential scriptures" of the non-dual schools.[43]

verse 94
Although both variants in *94c* are different from the text of the *Mālinī*, the version with the verse-filling *vai* in K_{ed} and J_2 is less convincing.

The scriptural support for the multiplicity of powers is *Mālinī* 3.5–6. The full text of the quotation runs as follows:

yā sā śaktir jagaddhātuḥ kathitā samavāyinī |
icchātvaṃ tasya sā devi sisṛkṣoḥ pratipadyate ||5||
saikāpi saty anekatvaṃ yathā gacchati tac chṛṇu |
evam etad iti jñeyaṃ nānyatheti suniścitam ||6||

---

39 Śiva worshipped as Tumburu with these four powers is one of the pantheons described in the *Netratantra*. See Introduction, p. 22.

40 *ekavīro yāmalo 'tha triśaktiś caturātmakaḥ | pañcamūrtiḥ ṣaḍātmāyaṃ saptako 'ṣṭakabhūṣitaḥ ||110||* ... [Commentary:] *yathā ekavīro mṛtyujiti prathamadhyāne | yāmalaḥ tatraiva | kulaprakriyāyāṃ tisraḥ śaktayaḥ parādyāḥ | caturātmā jayādibhedena | pañcamūrtiḥ sadyojātāditayā | tad uktaṃ: siddhānte pañcakaṃ sāraṃ catuṣkaṃ vāmadakṣiṇe | trikaṃ tu bhairave tantre ...*

41 Commenting on the word *sāra* as a synonym found in the "main Āgamas" for the highest reality Abhinava says: *śrīsāraśāstre 'pi nirūpitam: yat sāram asya jagataḥ sā śaktir mālinī parā | iti*, ĪPV vol. 1, p. 211. See also SANDERSON (1990b), p. 45, fn. 70.

42 See GNOLI (1972), p. 891 and DVIVEDA (1983b), p. 39f.

43 TĀV 14.33 understands *Sāraśāstras* as "*Ūrmikaula* and others" (See GNOLI (1972), p. 892).

verses 95–97
In TĀ 1.95ff Abhinavagupta says that God is described by words taught in the Śāstras that are formed through "etymology" and gives examples of etymologies of Bhairava from the lost *Śivatanuśāstra*. The *sodaryaiḥ* in *95c* therefore means "related to the denoted object", a fact that can be demonstrated through *nirvacana*, rather than "related to one another". *nirbhara* in *95a* is part of such a *nirukti* of Bhairava.[44] For the use of "nearer" and "further away", cf. TĀV 5.6: *kecid dhi upāyāḥ saṃvidi saṃnikṛṣṭāḥ, kecic ca viprakṛṣṭāḥ* |

In these verses the author carefully introduces the concept of the highest deity being ultimately nameless. The reason for this is that names, being mental constructions, are dependent on prior manifestation.

verse 98
The doctrine of a formless deity has its problems, if one wishes to establish a school above others, a school which has not only a formless level, but also specific pantheons. One has to safeguard some forms of worship against a too radical mystical devaluation of form.[45] The "group of words" (*tat* = *śabdajātam*) that describes the highest deity appropriately is therefore not "just conceptual", for the point of much of the preceding discussion has been to prove that the threefold and fivefold structure of Śiva's powers is a direct representation of reality, – as will be the fivefold Śāstra.

But even if one wishes to deny any connection between *vikalpa* and reality, and thereby make the concepts expressed in the Śāstra irrelevant, our author maintains that the ideas contained in the Śāstra are still Śiva's "constructions", or at least inspired by him. The causative may hint at the different interlocutors in the Āgamas, who are producing the doctrine originally taught by Śiva.

verse 99ab
As TĀ 11.21–23 shows, the Trika according to Abhinavagupta knows of two *tattva*s beyond the thirty-six pan-Śaiva ones. Beyond the thirty-sixth *tattva*, which is called *śiva*, there is *paraśiva* as the thirty–seventh, and beyond that a thirty-eighth. The *śivatattva* is completely empty (*śūnyātiśūnya*), thereby representing the complete transcendence of all (lower) *tattva*s, but this negation cannot be the highest reality for the Trika. There is therefore a thirty-seventh *tattva* which is the undivided, autonomous reality. But even this level of reality can be made the object for meditation and instruction. There is therefore a

44 See SANDERSON (1990b), p. 75, fn. 178.

45 Abhinavagupta's attitude to ritual is quite similar. See SANDERSON (1990b), 9.3.1–9.4.

thirty-eighth reality that is utterly subjective and – as Jayaratha says – "pure knowledge" (*bodhamātra*).[46] It is difficult to say whether Abhinavagupta's doctrine is represented properly by Jayaratha, but when we take into consideration the description in the TĀ, the thirty-eighth, as an unobjectifiable reality that is also unnamed, fits our context better. The variant in J_1 is therefore rejected.

verses 99cd–101

This form of time is not identical with the *tattva* of the same name, but is a power that belongs to Śiva himself.[47] Jayaratha (TĀV 6.7) explains that one talks of a power or potentiality (*śakti*) to indicate that Śiva does not suffer this differentiation himself, he is still beyond sequence and non-sequence; "a fire, though united with the power to burn, does not show any [signs of being itself burnt] like blisters".

verses 101cd–102ab

tatra could be interpreted in a variety of ways, but it must refer to the place where according to Abhinavagupta time has no differentiating influence.

5.5 The Transcendence of Purity

verses 102cd–103

vidyādi refers to an intermediate level in the series of *tattva*s, represented by *māyā* and the five *kañcuka*s: *kalā, vidyā, rāga, kāla, niyati*. That the Siddhānta opponent has selected *vidyā* is probably not significant. The series of *kañcuka*s usually starts with *kalā* or *kāla* in the theology of the Siddhānta.[48]

This question introduces a line of argumentation which is crucial for Abhinavagupta's exegesis of the *Mālinītantra*. As indicated in the introduction, the *Mālinī* shares the basic dualism of many other Āgamas, and from this perspective our author's claim to be based only on this text and simultaneously to uphold a non-dualistic theory is remarkable. It would on the other hand also be un-

46 Jayaratha also records that some "who have fallen to the state of nescience" quarrel over whether this doctrine exists only in order to avoid the accusation of having two mutually contradicting qualities, namely transcendence (*viśvottīrṇa*) and immanence (*viśvamaya*) in one reality. He also rejects the allegation of being in contradiction with scripture on the grounds that the thirty-seventh is only for instruction.

47 See commentary on *53*.

48 In the Siddhānta Tantras we find a very variable picture. See GOODALL (1995), p. xix.

fair to say that Abhinava is deliberately misunderstanding or reinterpreting his primary scriptural source in a manner which is completely foreign to it. There is probably no one philosophy that follows naturally from an Āgama. Dualistic exegesis too has difficulties in finding a consistent philosophy expounded in the text. In a sense much Āgamic material appears to be pre-theoretic, or not properly systematized; whether this is due to a complicated history of redaction, or also to the nature of these texts remains to be seen.

From an unbiased perspective the obstacles to Abhinava's monistic reading are, however, considerable: the hierarchical structure of the universe with its division into a pure and an impure part are too pervasive, and important for the religious practice he wishes to explain, for a simple non-dualism to be convincing.

In our verse the first problem is raised by the opponent in a forward leap: if we accept this theory of *prakāśa* being the common denominator of everything, the final consequence would be that the hierarchy of *tattva*s could not be maintained, because all the *tattva*s would partake of Śiva's purity. It has to be remembered that in the dualists' account of creation Śiva is not in contact with the impure part of the universe, but Ananta, a partially liberated soul, is entrusted with the "office" (*adhikāra*) of creating the lower universe and other minions administer it.[49]

verse 104

The intensive *narīnṛtyāmahe* occurs also in TĀ 10.34: *apūrvam atra viditaṃ narīnṛtyāmahe tataḥ*. According to Jayaratha the line is meant to be polemical.

verse 105

There are two more or less obvious interpretations: *tat* in pāda c could refer to the "highest reality", Śiva etc., or to *kathā*. I have adopted the second in order to maintain consistency with *124*. It then comes to mean that the concept of purity and impurity is not a feature of reality itself, but only of the concepts we form about reality, and it is therefore difficult to evade in a discussion, which must necessarily work with the dualism inherent in conceptual thought.

49 The locus classicus for this is *Kiraṇatantra* 3.26–7. Cf. also SANDERSON (1992), p. 282–287.

verses 106–107

The objection is not easily answered, as it presupposes the monists' theory of ritual interpreted as knowledge and related issues.[50] But there is a detailed discussion of the problem of purity in the TĀ, which I shall briefly summarize. The pan-Indian concept of purification is applied in the *Tantrāloka* (e.g. 4.118ab), but not without translation into the realm of cognition. The reason given for this is the illogicality inherent in the concept of purification and the scriptural injunction that all rules concerning religious practice are invalid at the highest level. The crucial passage from the eighteenth chapter of the *Mālinītantra*, which is discussed in TĀ 4.212cd–275, starts with: "Here [on this level of practice] there is no purity or impurity."(MVT 18.74a) The analysis then starts with the question of whether purity and impurity belong to the nature of an object. If they did, purification would amount to a change of the nature of a thing, which is impossible. Moreover, if we were to subscribe to a materialistic theory of purification, we would have to assume substances that would be at the same time pure, as they would purify objects lower on the *tattva* scale, as well as impure, as they themselves could be purified by those above them. But apparently the concept of religious purity does not allow of such a relativism. If we were to suppose that *mantra*s are the cause of purity,[51] then it should be their identity with Śiva which effects the purification. But in this case everything else would be equally pure through being identical with Śiva as the light of manifestation and the concept itself would thus be rendered invalid.[52] But in the *mantra*s it is their consciousness of the nature of Śiva that constitutes their purity and likewise all levels of reality can be pure, if only the Yogi recognizes their identity with Śiva. With this argument purity has become a form of knowledge and has been transferred from the object to the subject.

verse 108

In Abhinava's use *vandhya* ("barren") is far from its literal meaning, for a more natural translation: "although he is completely unable to produce diversity" is excluded by being in contradiction with his philosophy.

It should be noted that the question concerned the problem of impurity, but

50 The question concerning initiation is dealt with only in the second part of the *Vārttika* (II.*152–154*). For the theory of ritual from a non-dualist perspective, see SANDERSON (1995).

51 This, by the way, shows the relevance of this discussion for initiation, where the *mantra*s are the "tools" for purification.

52 According to Jayaratha the aim is not to prove the invalidity of the concept itself, but its transcendence on the highest level of practice.

the answer is about duality. I do not think that Abhinava is trying to evade the problem: for the Kaulas the transcendence of purity and impurity *is* non-duality put into practice (*advaitācāra*).

verses 109–110ab
The appearance of duality in non-duality does not itself constitute *saṃsāra*. It is only by forgetting the real identity of the appearance as light that souls become "bound". To distinguish between pure and impure is a symptom of *saṃsāra*, and its absence proof that one has risen beyond it.[53]

As defined in the Trika *māyā* is not a kind of delusion, but the perception of something as different from consciousness (*bhinnavedyaprathā*). Similarly ignorance (*avidyā*) is not absence of knowledge, but incomplete knowledge.

verses 110cd–112ab
We cannot accuse the author of being prolix here. He will come back to the concept of "anxiety" or "inhibition" in the next verse, but here he is trying to answer the serious objection of not being in accord with scripture.

"This Śāstra" can only mean the *Mālinī*, but I have not been able to find a "*bhagavadyoga*" there. We could suspect a lost passage or just a very free paraphrase, but it is more likely a variant reading for MVT 1.4, which runs in all the sources:[54] *bhagavan yogasaṃsiddhikāṅkṣiṇo vayam āgatāḥ*. With this verse – as well as MVT 1.10a – the whole Āgama is put into the right perspective for Abhinavagupta, since it indicates in the very beginning that the main aim of this Śāstra is not liberation through action, i.e. ritual, but through Yoga. His reading *bhagavadyogaḥ* could add another important point, namely that *yoga* is to be understood as a unification (*yujir yoge*) with Śiva and not just a kind of trance (*yuj samādhau*) that could accommodate different concepts of liberation.[55]

Verses *111cd–112ab* describe the method of teaching a non-dualistic doctrine under these conditions, that is, to disciples who are bound by dualistic thoughts. It is to take into account all dualistic notions and to dispel them by minute anal-

53 Cf. the role of the "consumption of a sacramental impurity" in the unconventional initiation of the non-dualists. See SANDERSON (1995), p. 46.

54 Somadev VASUDEV, who is preparing a critical edition of the MVT, kindly informed me that according to the sources available at the moment there is no such variant in the transmission of the Tantra. A confusion of the ligatures of *dya* and *nya* in Śāradā is however conceivable.

55 Different types are mentioned, for instance, in the *Śaivaparibhāṣā* (p. 341): *utpatti, saṃkrānti, samāveśa* and *abhivyakti*.

ysis.[56] With this definition he is able to explain that the Śāstra uses dualistic terminology only in order to transcend it.

verses 112cd–114

In a system of non-duality the concept of unification (*yoga*) itself has to be reinterpreted, since there is no way one can "enter" into Bhairava, or remain[57] in him, for this would imply a duality of the soul and Śiva. In the formulation of the Pratyabhijñā the soul can only recognize its true nature to be Śiva, and consequently the Trika had to reinterpret both ritual and meditation as encapsulating this knowledge. The unity with Śiva cannot be produced, as it is already there, but, unlike the Siddhānta, which held the view that ignorance was caused by a substance-like covering of the soul that had to be removed by an action [i.e. ritual], it conceived of the obstacles in more psychological terms:

> "Therefore repeated practice serves to obliterate the identification with the state of being the [artificial] subject [centred in the] body etc.,[58] but not in order to attain the [real] identity which is always (?) the essence of manifestation.[59]

On a more philosophical level the same principle can be applied. As duality is a given fact, it would neither be possible nor make sense to teach non-duality directly. The dualistic concepts have to be analysed to be finally negated.

To summarize: the opponent's question (*107*) is dealt with in two ways; firstly, ritual is not the primary concern of the *Mālinī*, but Yoga; secondly, it is necessary for didactic reasons to suppose duality. This means that even if large parts of the *Mālinī* are dualistic and advocate ritual action, only portions or even single statements in the text that deal with Yoga and negate the dichotomies of ordinary religious life (pure/impure, etc.) represent the actual, non-dualistic doctrine of the Tantra, i.e. its Kaula essence.

---

56 For a similar phrase for "detailed exposition", cf. *vibhajya vyākhyātam*, ĪPV 1.1.1, vol. 1, p. 23.

57 *upaveśa* means literally "sitting down", but in *upaviṣṭa*, for instance, the sense is extended to "arrived".

58 The *Pratyabhijñākārikā*s know of several artificial (*kṛtrima*) identities based on the body, the vital energy, the mind and the void. The first to mention these is probably Kallaṭa in his commentary on *Śivasūtra* 1.1.

59 *ata eva dehādipramātṛtābhimānanimajjanāyābhyāso na tu sadā prathamānatāsārapramātṛtāprāptyartham*, quoted in *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* (Sūtra 15, p. 36) as being from the author of the *Śrīpratyabhijñā*, i.e. Utpaladeva.

verses 115–116

The first line is problematic. *yāvadgati* could be translated as "by all means", "as far as possible",[60] but judging from the context I think that Abhinava is trying to stand against the non-dualistic Vedānta here and to define his *advaitavādaḥ* as inclusive. For him duality is always present as an appearance in the non-dual ground; duality is therefore not entirely rejected, one does not remain aloof (*udāsīna*) and ignores it, but sees it for what it is: an expansion of one's own self.[61]

116 makes it clear that a vedāntic conception of non-duality would devalue most of the doctrinal constants of Śaiva theology, such as the "levels of reality" (*tattva*). If liberation were conceived of as the obliteration of all duality, the thirty-five *tattva*s below Śiva would be utterly useless.

I could not find any indication in the text that Abhinavagupta wanted to discuss or reject Sāṃkhya doctrine with "twenty-five" *tattva*s in *116c*; it is more likely that a scribe did not understand the significance of the number "thirty-five" in the context and "corrected" it.

verse 117

An Indian commentary might introduce this verse with the objection that if duality somehow remains all one's life, what is the point of being liberated in life.

Apparently it is the absence of the fear or inhibition, which we have described as a symptom of *saṃsāra*, that defines the liberated state, rather than the mere absence of duality.

verse 118

The K_{ed} reads *118c* as a compound.

I have eventually decided to cut through the Gordian knot by reversing the position of *tad* and *yat*.

The *Vijñānabhairava* is important for Abhinavagupta's Trika in as much as it lends scriptural support for higher non-ritualistic levels inside the Trika, characterized by an increasing "essentiality". This perspective emerges from the introductory part of this Tantra, where every "structured form" of the deity is called an illusion, taught only to provide those who are unable to grasp the formless deity with some "means of concentrating their awareness in meditation."[62] The

---

60 Bhāskara glosses it once as *yāvadupāyam*. See below.

61 ĪPK 4.1.12: *sarvo mamāyaṃ vibhava ity evaṃ parijānataḥ | viśvātmano vikalpānāṃ prasare 'pi maheśatā ||*

62 See SANDERSON (1990b), p. 74–76.

doctrines taught in the Yāmala[tantras] (see *Vijñānabhairava* 1) are therefore not useless, but necessary for the movement from duality to non-duality, as every instruction in non-duality has to start from duality.

verses 119–120

The same verse from Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa's *Stavacintāmaṇi* is quoted in ĪPV 1.2.1 and in Bhāskarakaṇṭha's *Cittānubodhaśāstra* 2.165 (p. 38).

In the introductory verse to this chapter of the ĪPV the author accords a metaphysical necessity to the opponent's view (*pūrvapakṣa*), namely as that which is manifested by Śiva himself in order to dispel it:

> We adore Śiva, who manifests everything in division as the *pūrvapakṣa* and then leads it to non-duality as the correct view.[63]

Bhāskara, the commentator on Abhinavagupta's *Vimarśinī*, develops the idea slightly further by calling, in his introductory verse on the same chapter, non-duality the "middle argument":

> "We adore Śiva, who after destroying duality as the *pūrvapakṣa* with the middle view of non-duality, finally adopts the highest [i.e. inclusive] non-duality.[64]

But the principle is not only applied to philosophical views, but also to religious practice. In his commentary on Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa's verse Kṣemarāja introduces it with the question why, if only knowledge is effective, ritual is taught at all:

> "If according to the [Advaita]Vedānta everything is part of the Lord, then why is not only knowledge taught in the portions [of authoritative texts] that deal with action,[65] and [furthermore] how can [action] be [taught and then] forbidden in the portions dealing with knowledge …"[66]

Two verses before in the *Stavacintāmaṇi* the three Vedas had been mentioned and the commentary therefore applies the idea to the Vedānta by following the

---

63 *pūrvapakṣatayā yena viśvam ābhāsya bhedataḥ | abhedottarapakṣāntar nīyate taṃ stumaḥ śivam ||*, ĪPV on 1.2, vol. 1, p. 51.

64 *pūrvapakṣamayadvaitam advaitān madhyapakṣataḥ | niṣkṛṣyānte parādvaitapakṣavantaṃ śivaṃ stumaḥ ||*

65 That means that knowledge would be enough and should alone be taught.

66 *yadi śrutyantānusāreṇa sarvaṃ bhagavanmayaṃ, tat kasmāt karmakāṇḍeṣu jñānam eva na upadiśyate, kathaṃ ca jñānakāṇḍeṣu tad eva niṣidhyata iti saṃśayaṃ śamayati stutidvāreṇa …*, *Stavacintāmaṇivivṛti*, p. 79.

context, but in the *Vārttika* it is obviously applied to different layers within the Āgama and more specifically within the Trika.[67]

Kṣemarāja's line of interpretation is this: the opponent's view (*pūrvapakṣa*) is taught by God himself as that which must be abandoned and it is only ignorance that leads some to adopt it. Other interpretations are added to this idea to make plausible why this fact is not stated in clearer terms in the proper place, i.e. in the lower scriptures themselves. There is the secrecy of the higher teachings that is adduced as a reason why it is only revealed to those fit for it. Another motivation for Śiva is the necessity of protecting the five cosmic acts, that is, to make creation, which necessarily entails obscuration (*tirodhāna*), possible. In keeping with his context Kṣemarāja directs his polemic against "those deluded people" (i.e. the Mīmāṃsakas) who devalue the aspect of knowledge by saying that it is only a praise of ritual action, not a description of facts.[68]

verse 121ab
is not very clearly phrased. Surely our author wants to say that the combination of heterogeneous elements in the verse from the *Stavacintāmaṇi* creates the poetical effect, and that this combination is expressed by *ca*. The only *ca* in the verse is in *120a*, but this combination is not so surprising. What must have been interesting for Abhinavagupta in this context is the close combination between 'veiling' and 'unveiling', a combination which is expressed only by the absolutive followed by the participle. I therefore assume that to express this combination, our author rephrased part of the verse: *udbhāvyante bhramāś ca* [*bhidyante ca*] and wished to emphasize with the *atra* that not the *ca* in the quoted verse itself, but the one in his paraphrase, is meant. It is therefore the combination between *udbhāvya* and *bhindate* that is the unexpected element in Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa's verse.

---

67 For the terminology of *kriyākāṇḍa* or *karmakāṇḍa* versus *jñānakāṇḍa*, cf. Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's *Mṛgendravṛtti*, Kriyāpāda 1.1.

68 See Kṣemarāja *ad. loc.*: *he deva svatantraceṣṭita, bhave saṃsāre ye saṃbhrāntāḥ tvanmāyāśaktivaśāt vyāmūḍhāḥ, tata eva ca bhedāsaktatvāt karmaniṣṭhāḥ teṣāṃ pūrvakakṣyāyāṃ tāṃ tāṃ bhedabhrāntim udbhāvya siddhāntakakṣyāyāṃ bhindate dhvaṃsakāya, tathā jñānānandaṃ paramādvayarūpaṃ vijñānam ānandamayaṃ vṛtvā prathamaṃ rahasyatvāt ayogyān prati ācchādya, paścāt yogyān prati vivṛṇvate sphuṭīkurvate, tubhyaṃ namaḥ | evaṃ ca yat pūrvapakṣatayā karmakāṇḍasvarūpaṃ bhagavatā heyatvena darśitaṃ, tad eva mūḍhaiḥ upādeyatvena abhyupagamya, jñānakāṇḍasya arthavādatvam ucyate | atha vā bhagavataiva sṛṣṭyādikṛtyacatuṣṭayarakṣāyai te tādṛśāśvāsavanto vyāmohitāḥ sthāpitāḥ |*, *Stavacintāmaṇivivṛti*, p. 80f. (The edition has a wrong hyphen after *atha vā-*.)

verses 121cd–122ab

The "purification of the *adhvan*", as part of the Śaiva initiation, is only possible if the teacher becomes one with Śiva in order to unite the disciple's soul with the higher levels of reality. A purely dualistic theory must therefore leave part of the efficacy of initiation unexplained. This answers the objection raised in *107*.

verse 122cd

The opponent seems to follow up to this point, but takes exception to the word "only".

verse 123

This definition of non-duality might be seen as contradictory to the preceding. A traditional commentator would probably say that the present verse describes ultimate reality, where there is no more question of *heya* and *upādeya*, but the previous section had described the way to this goal by refutation of duality.

Here the qualification of this doctrine of non-duality as "supreme" is crucial. On the one hand non-duality is only conceivable as an *uttarapakṣa*, an antithesis to dualism. On the other hand it cannot continue to stand in opposition to it, as this opposition would itself disprove non-duality:

> "But non-duality is not taught by us to be the exclusion of duality; this would only prove your position, for then the duality would be explicit. That in which [the notions] 'this is duality', 'this is not duality' and 'this is duality plus non-duality' equally appear is what is called non-duality."[69]

This supreme non-duality is a philosophical position which is able to accommodate everything.[70]

verse 124

GNOLI translates the verse, reading the transmitted *rasān*, as follows: "Dal punto di vista del dualista, tutte le cose sono invece confinante in se stesse, e, quindi, la non-dualit... non può fare altro, a mio parere, che un buco nell'acqua."[71] Given the economy of Abhinava's style it is, I think, less likely that *iti*

---

69 *na hy advayaṃ dvayāveśabādhenāsmābhir ucyate | tvatpakṣopagamo hy eṣa syād dvayaṃ tad dhi susphuṭam || idaṃ dvaitam idaṃ neti tad idaṃ ca dvayādvayam | iti yatra samaṃ bhāti tad advayam udāhṛtam* || MVV I.*628–9*.

70 *sarvānugrāhakaṃ pakṣaṃ*, MVV I.*631*; *viśvānugrāhātmakam* MVV II.*18*. See also in the second *kāṇḍa* of the *Vārttika*, vs. *42*, *151* and *329*.

71 GNOLI (1979), p. 41.

śabdo 'yaṃ should be used in such a weak sense. Moreover I doubt that the Sanskrit shares the idiom "un buco nell' acqua"[72] and therefore propose to read *rasāt* in the sense of "automatically".[73]

bhedayate is therefore not a causative, but a denominative and a confusion of the two can explain the variant *rasān* as a attempt to provide the accusative object. Provided the interpretation is correct, the verse would work very well with *105* in trying to explain why this peculiar non-dualism cannot be easily understood from the perspective of dualism.

Abhinava therefore says in the ĪPV:

> As we will state later the "consciousness" that can be expressed refers to objectivity, because it becomes the object of differential thought and, since it is created, is not the highest consciousness. The same applies to its [other] names: "agent of action and cognition" and "god". Therefore one should strive by all means to avoid the fault of degradation through becoming an object. [...] But for the purpose of instruction it is impossible to avoid completely that it becomes an object.[74]

verses 125–126

For *alam*, see p. 53

The two verses form a couplet in a new metre and, judging from the contents, the variation of form here indicates a summary. The first verse ends the discussion on non-duality and recapitulates the statements concerning the relationship between consciousness, i.e. Śiva, and time. The second rephrases the important concept of an appearance of duality within non-duality.

In the part of the text discussed here the *prakṛtam* is mentioned in *160a*, *249a* and *347*, where it refers more or less directly to the doctrine of the five streams, but in the section preceding *126* the author was still discussing the nature of knowledge itself and its relation to time as a preliminary to that.

126d and the following line in brackets are problematic: the unmetrical *svātantryāt* could be corrected, for instance to *nirapekṣaṃ*, but the chances of

---

72 Provided my interpretation of the Italian as being equivalent with German: "ein Schlag ins Wasser" is correct.

73 *rasāt* is used by the author in TĀ 37.39 and 4.115; *svato rasāt* in PTV, p. 216 ("spontaneamente" GNOLI (1985), p. 137). Cf. also the use of *svarasataḥ* in TĀV 15.47.

74 *saṃvid iti tu ucyamānā vikalpyatvena prameyatāṃ spṛśantī sṛṣṭatvāt na paramārthasaṃvit – iti vakṣyāmaḥ | kartā jñātā ca maheśvara – ityabhidhāne 'pi sa eva prakāra āpatet, iti – yathā yathā prameyabhūmikāpādananyakkārakalaṅkaparihāraḥ śakyaḥ tathā tathā yāvadgati yatitavyam ...upadeśāvasare hi sarvātmanā tāvat sā prameyatā asya parihartum aśakyā* | ĪPV 1.1.2 (vol. 1, p. 32f).

arriving at more than a merely metrically possible reading with the same sense are remote.

The line that follows in all sources cannot be anything but a scribal gloss, because of the way it refers to the preceding verse.

verse 127

In pāda b *aham eṣa* is emphatic (cf. *so 'ham* APTE (1986), s.v. *tad*, no. 5.): "this I which is manifold".

"Maitra and Caitra" means "anyone" and *-prāyāḥ* adds the sense of approximation.

This question is only a modification of the previous one on omniscience. If consciousness is undivided and present in all subjects, and, moreover, source of the powers of cognition and action, then an intersubjective identity in action and even in knowledge is inexplicable.

ekaghanabhāvavimarśa could mean "a homogeneous awareness of being", but, in order to indicate the implicit duality, "becoming" is preferable. For the problem of the opponent is not the awareness of unity, but the different scope of knowledge in subjects that are ultimately identical with Śiva.[75]

verse 128

As so often, Abhinava starts his answer by bewailing the stupidity of the opponent. He then affirms his radical theory of manifestation: the opponent's question is not valid, because it refers to something inside manifestation, but it has never been denied that duality exists in manifestation. It has only been stated that this duality is, however real, on a very different level than non-duality.

The main misunderstanding of the opponent, from this perspective, lies in his unwillingness to acknowledge the fundamental priority of a light that is utterly unobjectifiable. The question is inappropriate in as much as it presupposes that the qualities of this light are to be found equally in all its manifestations.

verse 129

This verse is too elliptic to be sure about the interpretation: *nanu* might start a question and *naitat* the answer. But the next verse elaborates on the concept

75 As a grammatical term *bhāvaḥ* describes also a 'process' activity (Pāṇini 3.3.11). See Eivind KAHRS' article in: Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson. Ed. by Eivind Kahrs, Oxford: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture 1986, p. 115ff. Compare also ALBRECHT WEZLER, Bestimmung und Angabe der Funktion von Sekundär-Suffixen durch Pāṇini, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag 1975, p. 99f, where *bhāva* is translated as "dynamisches Sein" (p. 103).

of "possession" (*mamakāra*) and suggests that the emphasis is on the notion of "mine". The syntax (*nanu **me***) would work very well with this assumption. Understood in this way the verse would mean that the mere process of perception or appearance of a thing that is seen as the manifestation of consciousness does not entail any duality. It is only the notion that something *belongs* to oneself and not to others which creates a division that misrepresents reality.

verse 130
Dvaipāyana might stand for Durvāsas in a Śaiva context, the Ṛṣi, whose mind-born sons, according to the legend related in *Śivadṛṣṭi* 7.107ff (quoted in TĀV 1.8), were the source of the threefold Śaiva revelation. But here it is a reference to the *Bhagavadgītā*,[76] where "*mamakāra*" is mentioned in 2.71, 12.13 and 18.53 (*nirmama*). In his commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* Abhinavagupta sees this sense even in the *māmakāḥ* ("our people" or "selfish") in the initial verse of the text. This unobtrusive reference to the *Gītā* is used to prove that such a doctrine is to be found even on the most general level of scriptures.

verses 131–132
This verse is to be connected with *125*, where the relationship between consciousness and time was mentioned as the main topic. It tries to reconcile the notion of time as a differenting force with the indivisibility of consciousness through the *sarvasarvātmakatvavāda*, the doctrine that everything consists of everything.[77] This doctrinal peculiarity explains why the fullness of consciousness persists within differentiation.

The phrase *kālakalanā* in *131a* is an echo of *Vijñānabhairava* 14. For the root *kal* and its interpretation, see commentary on *90f*.

---

76 Cf. Abhinavagupta's *Gītārthasaṃgraha*, introductory verse 2: *dvaipāyanena muninā yad idaṃ vyadhāyi śāstraṃ …*

77 See TORELLA (1987), WEZLER (1982), WEZLER (1992) and WEZLER (1981).

Section 6
The Five Streams of the Śāstra

6.1 Kula

verses 133–134
Having explained how there can be difference in unity and simultaneously fullness, i.e. a state of differentiation without division, he takes up the proposition made already in *50* about the fivefold nature of the universe and applies it to the Śaiva revelation.

Without the conjecture in *134ab* the line would mean: "By subordinating the persistence of the [state of being the] power and the soul, the highest deity [of speech] is emphasizing [this sense of the Śāstra] in her own self." But this does not work well, as the next verse starts with with a reference to the previous (*ittham*) and has Śiva as its subject.

The translation assumes that we are talking about levels of sense in the Śāstra: one belonging to Śiva or Śaṃbhu, one of power (*śākta*) and one of the soul (*aṇu*), hereby following one of the interpretations of the word Trika. The compound *śaktyaṇusthitim* might therefore be interpreted as *śāktam āṇavam ca* [*śāstrārtham*].

verses 134cd–138ab
As a general rule, different doctrines are alluded to in this account of the Śāstra in order to clarify their relative position in the hierarchy: those on a higher plane represent truth more completely than those positioned on lower levels. The Trika is an exception in as much as its structure encompasses different layers.

Our author has started with the Trika through defining its characteristic as the equilibrium of the three powers that defines the highest undifferentiated state, and proceeds now to the Kula. But in fact the relationship between the different layers of the text is more intricate, as we are moving from the "highest Trika", which is a metaphysical concept that is probably without a socio-religious correlate, to the Kula, which, as we have seen, represents a plane within the Trika

with a specific initiation.[1] The fact that a subsidiary topic, namely how to conceive of time in an undifferentiated reality, is more on the mind of the opponent adds to the confusion, for the doctrinal background on which time is dealt with is the Krama, another cult which belongs in some sense to the core of the Trika. One ought to bear in mind that the first part of the *Vārttika* is not a systematic description of the five streams of the Śāstra, but a complicated argumentation to legitimate the Trika's claim to the highest position. Through the disparateness of topics that is covered by it and the vagueness of its references to religious reality the argumentation seems sometimes unconnected.

In verses *134cd–138ab* the process of the creation of the universe, that is of duality from unity, is crystallized in the term *visarga*, "emission". The first meaning in our context is that of "pouring out creation" from an undivided state. Parallel to this run at least two other levels of meaning: (1) Creation symbolized as sound, where *visarga* is the letter of the Sanskrit alphabet of the same name which comes into being by a division in the *bindu*, the single dot, which signifies the expansion of the undivided reality. (2) The sexual metaphor of creation as ejaculation (*visarga*).[2] The Kula is frequently called "secret", perhaps because of its sexual metaphors and practices, and this may account for the obscure language as well as the more poetical tone which our author sometimes adopts when dealing with it.

135cd–138ab is an attempt to devalue time as an objective reality by deriving it from the primary act of creation: the process of emission is not something that takes place on a time scale, but the differentiation involved in this process produces internal time as a by-product.

6.2 Time

verses 138cd–139

The opponent does not accept this paradoxical account and confronts our author with a commonsensical definition of time.

The conveniently metrical, but ungrammatical singular *vibhajyate* can be justified by taking "past" and "future" as separate since their boundaries to the present lies so to speak at opposite ends.

1 See SANDERSON (1997).

2 See PADOUX (1990), p. 277ff, and TĀ 3.136cd–137ab.

verses 140–141
In *140ab* a *tasmād* correlating with *yatra* has to be supplied. I understand *141cd* to mean the following: if there were a real dividing line between past, present and future, not only would there be a division of one object from the other, as we notice in the manifestation of duality which constitutes the world, but also a division within a single object into past, present and future. That means the continuity observed in the world could not be explained. Abhinavagupta's own concept of time, i.e. as merely a qualifier of things, was stated earlier (*55–57*).

6.2.1 The Obliteration of Time in the Krama

The Krama is a non-dualistic system of Kālī worship and is the most heterodox of the Kashmirian systems used by Abhinavagupta.[3] For its transgressive practices it is, like the Kula, "esoteric", and discussion of its doctrines is often accompanied by a remark about its secrecy. Central to its doctrine is the worship of sequences (*krama*) of deities that describe the process of perception as "projection of content, immersion in content, retraction of content into the state of latent impression within the subject, and finally the dissolution of these subjective impressions in the implosion of consciousness into its pristine, non-discursive potentiality. In some traditions, pure luminosity (*bhāsā*) is worshipped as a fifth phase englobing these four as its creative vibrancy."[4]

Descriptions of the system frequently play on the symbolism of the three parts involved in the process of knowing and their metaphorical representations: the subject of knowledge is called "fire", as it "incinerates" the object and thereby continuously obliterates duality in the process of perception, only to recreate it in every new perception.[5] Knowledge is called the "sun", because it illuminates the object; and the object of knowledge itself is the "moon" which nourishes the perceiver. These identifications then allow the writer to play on solar and lunar symbolism: the sun, marking the outer realm and, more importantly, its time divisions into months etc., is naturally connected to the number twelve.[6] In the process of perception it symbolizes the eleven senses (five organs of sense, five of action, plus the mind) and *buddhi* [=*prakāśacakra*]. The moon with its sixteen parts is represented as the "circle of bliss" (*ānandacakra*)

---

3 A summary is given in SANDERSON (1987), s.v. Śaivism: Krama Śaivism.

4 SANDERSON (1987), Krama, p. 14f.

5 *yo 'yaṃ vahniḥ paraṃ tattvaṃ pramātur idam eva tat | ityādyuktyā parasaṃvidātmā pramātā tāvad bhedendhanadāhakatvād agniḥ* TĀV 4.124.

6 A reference to this in the context of the Krama occurs in *Mahānayaprakāśa* (TSS) 4.9ab: *māsarāśyādirūpo 'pi dvādaśātmānubhūyate |*

consisting of the twelve parts of the *prakāśacakra*, but with *buddhi* and *manas* counted as one, plus the five *tanmātras*.[7] For the present purpose it may suffice to clarify the terminology by translating a condensed description of this process from TĀ 5.63f:

> "Therefore it will manifest, fill and resorb[8] the object through the sun, which is devoted to initial effort (*udyoga*) and which consists of twelve parts."[9]
>
> [Commentary:] "*Therefore* – because it vibrates with the awareness of the "I" – *it*, the highest light, having manifested the level of the contracted subject, *will manifest* – project outside – every *object* to some extent (*ā* = *īṣat*), that is, as contracted like "blue", "joy" etc., *fill* it, that is hold it in existence in precisely this form for some time, and *resorb* it, i.e. destroy it by assimilation. It does so by virtue of the *sun*, i.e. the instrument of knowledge, which has a completely replete form, as it consists of *twelve parts*, [namely] the expressions (*parāmarśa*) [of sound] from "a" to *visarga* [which are twelve by] excluding the "barren" sounds and which is *devoted to initial effort* (*udyogaḥ …tatra saktena*), that is by being directed to the outside with the intention to manifest objects. This is the sense.[10]

The TĀ then goes on to describe the "moon" as that which devours this emission only to emit nectar (*amṛta*) into the fire of knowledge. The same metaphor for perception is used in the following verses in the *Vārttika*, where the author tries to show that the experience of meditation as described in the Krama is a state of consciousness in which time is transcended.

---

7 In fact the sequence according to the *Mahānayaprakāśa* starts with the fivefold *khacakra*, followed by *prakāśa-*, *ānandacakra*, then the *mūrticakra* with seventeen parts [*ahaṃkāra* is added to the sixteen of the *ānandacakra*] and *vṛndacakra*.

8 The verbal root *carc* is used as a technical term for "resorption" (*saṃharaṇa*) or "dissolution" (*vilāpanam*). The cognitive aspect for this process, as we will see below, is the "reflection" on the object which "dissolves" it.

9 *tata udyogasaktena sa dvādaśakalātmanā* ||63|| *sūryeṇābhāsayed bhāvaṃ pūrayed atha carcayet* ⌉ Jayaratha glosses *-saktena*, but the reading of the ms. *kha* in the KSTS edition of the TĀ gives *-raktena* which has an additional pun: "red".

10 *tato 'haṃparāmarśasphuraṇād dhetoḥ sa paraḥ prakāśaḥ saṃkucitapramātṛbhūmikāvabhāsanapurassaram udyogaḥ arthāvabibhāsayiṣā, tatra saktena sadaiva bahirmukhena dvādaśa ṣaṇḍha*[misprint in K_{ed}: *ṣaṇṭha*]*varjam akārādivisargāntā yāḥ kalāḥ parāmarśās tatsvabhāvena prāptaparipūrṇasvarūpeṇa pramāṇātmanā sūryeṇa ekaikaṃ bhāvam ā īṣat saṃkucitena nīlasukhādinā rūpeṇa bhāsayet bahiḥ sṛjet, pūrayet tathātvenaiva kaṃcit kālaṃ sthāpayet, carcayet svātmasātkāreṇa saṃhared ity arthaḥ* | See PADOUX (1990), p. 258 for the "barren" sounds.

verses 142–144
These verses describe the obliteration of time in what is conceived as the liberating experience in the Krama. In order to make the concept more accessible the timeless level of reality is not described in the process of creation, but from the perspective of dissolution or liberation.

As Jayaratha says, this structure of the process of perception is within ordinary human experience:

> "A [person as the] subject of experience who wishes to accomplish something will first perceive a group of objects as centred in knowledge, then think 'it is thus', and then rest in himself by becoming content in the thought 'now I know it' and dissolving the outer form, – this matter is therefore within [normal] experience.[11]

The difference to the practitioner – as Abhinavagupta says – is his heightened awareness of the present consciousness, which brings the process of projection to a momentary standstill, in which time is transcended and normal individuality dissolved.

verses 145–146
This short elaboration of the idea adds religious perspective to the psychological process. In a sense the practitioner is only released from the continuous cycle of projection, because the deities of consciousness are pleased by his offering that consists of his awareness of the object ("moon") in the present moment. Abhinavagupta redefines the ritual of gratification as a form of gnosis by evoking overlapping metaphors. The fullness of the moon, which comes about as the nectar is held inside instead of being poured out into the "fire of the consciousness" of the perceiver, alludes to the vessel for the offering to the goddesses. The white full moon resembles the sacrificial vessel of the Kāpālika, which is made of human skull, and provides a subtle connection to the heterodox background of the Krama.

verses 147–150ab
I think that this passage adds another aspect to the interpretation of the *mūlasūtra* of the MVT by mentioning the "moon of one's knowledge": the

---

11 *yaḥ kaś canārthakriyārthī hi pramātā pramāṇopārūḍham evārthajātaṃ prathamam ālocayet, anantaram 'idam itthaṃ' iti vikalpayet, tadanu 'jñāto 'yaṃ mayā arthaḥ' iti saṃtoṣābhimānād bahīrūpatāvilāpanena svātmany eva viśramayet – ity anubhavasākṣiko 'yam arthaḥ* | TĀV 6.63.

light of the moon which comes down to be reflected in the other faces and which will be described as the Kaula stream (*395*) can also be explained in the terminology of the Krama.

verses 150cd–151ab
From this verse it seems as if the discussion of Krama doctrine was adduced only to prove the commonsensical concept of time as being divided into past, present and future as ultimately invalid. But, as will become clear in *160*, the Krama is an integral part of the main topic.

verses 151cd–153ab
Once the division of future and past has been abandoned, even the concept of present time, and therefore of time itself becomes meaningless. The experiential equivalent of this theory is the practitioner of the Krama who "devours" time[12] and perceives objects while remaining in the non-dual absolute.[13]

tuṭiḥ is mentioned neither by the *pw*, nor in SCHMIDT's *Nachträge* or APTE's dictionary; it is given in MW, s.v., as a variant of *truṭiḥ*. In the writings of the Kashmirian Śaivas it is to my knowledge the standard form of the word.

verses 153cd–155ab
The source of this quotation, if it is not just a statement of doctrine, is not known. In the previous verse our author had described the goal of the Krama as a form of internalization, but on closer analysis also the absence of manifestation is due to the rays of one's own consciousness.

verses 155cd–156
A *Ḍāmara*[*śikhā*] is included in the list of sixty-four *Bhairavatantra*s in the *Śrīkaṇṭhī*,[14] where it is grouped with *Vāmatantra*s. In the *Tantrāloka* a *ḍāmarayāga* is mentioned in connection with the *Devyāyāmala*.

Prof. SANDERSON has pointed out to me that the same verse is quoted in the PTV as being from a *Vādyatantra*, and that Abhinavagupta's reference there to another work which deals more extensively with time is probably to this pas-

12 For *kālagrāsaḥ*, cf. *Mahānayaprakāśa* (TSS) 4.14: *atra dattāvadhānānāṃ deśakālakriyātmanaḥ | kālakramasya sahasā grāso bhavati yoginām* || "For the Yogīs whose attention is fixed there, the process of time, which consists of [the manifestation of] space, time and action, is suddenly devoured."

13 *khe brahmaṇy abhedarūpe sthitvā carati viṣayam avagamayati* | *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, p. 39.

14 Ed. in the Appendix, vs. 284. Quoted by Jayaratha on TĀV 1.18.

sage in the *Vārttika*.[15] This sequence of the completion of works, namely MVV → PTV → TĀ, is corroborated by the fact that Karṇa's death is mentioned only in the TĀ; from the way he is mentioned in the MVV and the PTV we must conclude that he must have been alive still.[16]

verses 157–158
The point of the two verses, which seemingly contradict the preceding statements, is to apply the same difference that persists between light and appearance to the state of *amṛta*, i.e. the present moment, and the expansion of rays. An ultimate absence of time does not conflict with "commonsensical time", as they are ontologically as distinct as light and appearance. This verse also serves to integrate the Krama concept of time with the Pratyabhijñā doctrine of appearance.

verse 159
Phrases like these indicate that one has dealt with the more heterodox aspects of the Śaiva religion. The socio-religious reason for the secrecy is the association of the Krama with the impure Kāpālika culture of the cremation grounds. Here, in philosophical debate, this secrecy is however derived from the nature of reality itself: the description of the process of perception is always short of reaching reality, which lies in the subjective present and evades any approach from the outside.[17] On a philosophical level it is not the heterodox cult performed in an impure environment, but reality itself that is hidden.

6.3 The Sixth Stream

verses 160–163ab
For *parameṣṭhin* meaning "Śiva", see ĪPK 1.5.14.

---

15 *tad uktaṃ śrīvādyatantre "saṃruddhya raśmicakraṃ svaṃ pītvāmṛtam anuttamam | kālobhayāparicchinnaṃ vartamāne sukhī bhavet ||" iti | vistāritaś ca vistarato 'nyatra mayaiva kālobhayāparicchedaḥ* |, PTV, p. 35. The name of the text remains problematic; SANDERSON has tentatively proposed *vādya* to mean "beginning with *vā*", i.e. *vāma*. Similarly opaque is the reference to a *Śrīlādyatantra* in PTV, p. 201, if it is not just wrong for *vādya*, as GNOLI suggests.

16 See commentary on *11–12*.

17 Cf. the quotation from the *Trika(tantra)sāra* in PTV, p. 171, and *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* (ad Sūtra 1, p. 4).

The secondary Sandhi *srotodbhavam* [←*srotaüdbhavam*[18]] in *162a* could be justified as *aiśa*, i.e. peculiar to the language of the author of the Tantras [Īśa = Śiva].[19]

The "[main] topic" mentioned here will occupy us through to the end of this section: the division of the Śaiva revelation into five streams and its integration into the non-dualist's account of scriptural revelation. This is accomplished by postulating a "highest" stream, literally one "higher than the higher" which has as its characteristic that it is not emitted by one of the five faces of Sadāśiva, but by the Goddess. It seems therefore that the lengthy discussion of the Krama concept of time, although formally prompted by the opponent's persistence on the topic, is an integral part of the description of the sixth stream. On the other hand the "perceptions emitted by the goddess" would more appropriately lead to Śākta scriptures and not to a Tantra like the *Bhargaśikhā* that is "taught by Śiva", and we might for that reason want to read *devavisṛṣṭāḥ* in *160ab*, assuming that a scribe still had the Krama passage in mind and understood *devī*. But if we take into account the fact that Abhinavagupta introduces the Krama in an indirect way, and veiled within the Trika,[20] the inconsistency in *devī* lies in his system and not in the transmitted text.

The *Bhargaśikhā* is quoted a few times in the *Tantrāloka*; the quotation in 4.255 on the "devouring" of death, time etc., fits well in our context. Other quotations – in 12.20 on *vīravrata*, 15.280 on *vāmācāra* – suggest that it was an important scripture for the non-dualists.[21] The main problem is however the qualification *saura-* given in our text. It could in theory distinguish two texts, one taught by Śiva and one by Sūrya, but then only the first would be appropriate to our context. It is more likely that a "Sauratantra" had already been included into the Śaiva canon by identifying Sūrya with Śiva.[22] A Tantra of this name actually appears in the *Śrīkaṇṭhī*'s list of Sauratantras![23]

The interpretation of the verse quoted from this lost Tantra is crucial to the whole section of the *Vārttika*. It is adduced to justify the claim that the non-dual

---

18 Cf. *namaükti* etc. in W.D. WHITNEY: Sanskrit Grammar, Cambridge, Massachusetts 199, 175d (p. 60).

19 See GOODALL (1995), p. xxiv–xxvii, for a list of *aiśa* forms in different Tantras.

20 See SANDERSON (1986), p. 204.

21 There are other quotations with variations in the name; in 23.6 a *Kacabhārgava* is quoted on knowledge being the only important quality of the guru, in 32.62 a *Bhargāṣṭakaśikhākula*; in *Spandasaṃdoha*, p. 12, on *vīrabhairava*.

22 See Kṣemarāja on *Sāmbapañcāśikā* 21 (p. 13): *śrībhargaśikhāyām api: naiṣa varṇo na vā śabdo na caivaivaṃ kalātmakaḥ | kevalaḥ paramānando vīro nityodito raviḥ || nāstameti na codeti na śānto na vikāravān | sarvabhūtāntaracaro bhānur bharga iti smṛtaḥ ||*.

23 See *Śrīkaṇṭhī*, verse 75.

Śāstras are not part of the five streams which are accepted by the Siddhānta, and of which the Siddhānta forms the highest, but are above it. Perhaps this is even to be understood as a slanted exegesis of the compound *parameśamukhodbhūta* in MVT 1.1. (and 1.7: *parameśamukhodgata*).

At this point the question suggests itself why it is the *Bhargaśikhā* and not the *Mālinītantra* itself that is adduced as an example for the highest scripture. Naturally we can only speculate on the distinctive qualities of the lost *Bhargaśikhā* that made it the candidate for this high position, but if we judge from the few quotations, it appears that the Tantra is adduced for the [*eka*]*vīra* form of Śiva/Bhairava, where the pantheon consists of Śiva alone, i.e. without an entourage of powers. This form is indeed appropriate for the "highest" level, in which the pentad of powers is not yet manifest, but on which a concrete *samācāra*, namely the worship of *vīrabhairava*, takes place.

The *Mālinītantra* on the other hand would surely be seen by Abhinavagupta as including the same level, but not as limited to it, and would therefore not serve as a good example. It will become clear later that the *Mālinī* as the highest Trikatantra is not only beyond duality and therefore representing the "higher", but also capable of leading from the world of duality to this higher truth in as much as it integrates the Aghora face whose characteristic it is to devour duality. The sectarian frame-work of Abhinavagupta's Trika runs parallel to his doctrine of supreme non-dualism: it embraces duality, i.e. lower forms of revelation from the perspective of the "supreme non-dualism". Transcendence of time, duality and the like therefore represents only one aspect of reality, while the superior scripture or system is the one which accommodates "transcendence as well as immanence".[24]

verses 163cd–164ab

If the emphasis is on *api* here, the verse would explain why there is not just one non-dualistic scripture, but a variety.

6.4 Trika Defined as "Half of Six"

verses 164cd–166

This is the definition of the Trika view of the Śaiva canon. At this point in the text the author has sufficiently defined the sixth stream and has shown that the pentad of streams that is known to his wider audience of dualists is derived from

---

24 *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* 8: *viśvottīrṇaṃ viśvamayaṃ ca iti trikādidarśanavidaḥ.*

it. The author will return to the details of this interpretation of *ṣaḍardha* at the end of this chapter.

The word Trika is more commonly interpreted as the triad of *nara, śakti*, and *śiva*,[25] or *parā, parāparā*, and *aparā*, but here Abhinava interprets the word *ṣaḍardha*, which could be taken as merely a synonym for Trika, but which according to his teacher is not just a synonym, but conveys a different sense. It implies that the doctrine of the Trika is derived from half, i.e. three, of the six streams, namely the highest stream (*ūrdhvordhva*), the Vāma and the Dakṣiṇa (cf. *394*). It is not quite clear why the author quotes his guru for this doctrine, as he quotes scripture for the same in TĀ 37.25ff, where he says after describing the MVT as the ultimate essence of the Vidyāpīṭha:

> This has been taught in the *Ratnamālā* by Śiva: the essence of all Tantras is the Kaula doctrine, which is based on the Vāma and Dakṣiṇa, and fuses both. [This is to be found] in the doctrine of the *ṣaḍardha*.[26]

There is however one problem with this: the text goes on to describe the defects of the Vāma and the Dakṣiṇa, but also the Siddhānta without apparent reason, and one could form the idea that this trinity consists rather of the Siddhānta, Vāma and Dakṣiṇa. One would also find other passages that at first sight confirm such an interpretation. As mentioned in the introduction, Jayaratha in his commentary on TĀ 1.18 expounds such a trinity, and it is also used in the etymology of Triśirobhairava in *395cd–397*. This is probably the reason why DYCZKOWSKI has explained the problematic *pūrvārdha* with a spatial interpretation: "The '*pūrvārdha*' seems to refer not to the 'half on the west side' but that 'in front' of Trika, i.e. the Siddhānta-, Vāma-, and Bhairavatantras of which Trika is the essence."[27]

It is however hard to believe that Abhinavagupta would have tried to defend an explanation of *ṣaḍardha*, according to which the 'half' would consist of four, namely *ūrdhvordhva*, Īśāna, Vāma and Dakṣiṇa. As will be explained later, the trinity of Īśāna, Vāma and Dakṣiṇa (*395cd–397*) is used by author to make a different point. But here the *pūrva* must refer to those Śāstras that are

---

25 *naraśaktiśivātmakaṃ trikaṃ* PTV, introductory verse 3.

26 *uktaṃ śrīratnamālāyām etac ca parameśinā* ||25|| *aśeṣatantrasāraṃ tu vāmadakṣiṇam āśritam* | *ekatra militaṃ kaulaṃ śrīṣaḍardhakaśāsane* ||26|| Similarly in the *Jayadratha-yāmala*, quoted in SANDERSON (1986), p. 186, footnote 83.

27 DYCZKOWSKI (1988), p. 174. In order to give the passage a spatial interpretation, we would have to assume a projection of the six streams into two dimensions. We could adduce the Bhita figure (KREISEL (1986), p. 61), where Vāmadeva and Aghora are in the eastern half, but it is unlikely that our author had this specific sequence in mind.

"earlier" in the sequence of creation, as their doctrine is ranked as higher. Such a sequence of the six *srotas* is reflected in the hierarchy of initiations. Even if the details of the different lists have to be brought into agreement,[28] it is apparent that the highest level is occupied by the initiation of the Trika and different modes [Mata, Kaula, Kula] which have no direct correspondence in the system of the *pañcasrotas*, but which could, for the time being, be treated as subdivisions of the Trika. This is followed by the Dakṣiṇa, the Vāma and, finally, the Siddhānta. Presumably the remaining two streams, namely that of the Gāruḍa- and Bhūtatantras, were without a religious correlate at the time of Abhinavagupta and are therefore left out of consideration. As our author says in TĀ 13.321, a person initiated in the "earlier" (*pūrva*) stream is authorized to perform initiation in those below, but not vice versa. *pūrvārdha* therefore means the three higher parts of the six streams: *ūrdhvordhva* (the sixth stream), the Dakṣiṇa and the Vāma. The trinity formed by Īśana [=Siddhānta], Vāma and Dakṣiṇa in a second step is an attempt on the side of the Trika to encompass the whole spectrum of Tantric Śaivism, i.e. down to the Siddhānta. It is the definition of Triśirobhairava, but not of *ṣaḍardha*.

The position of *alam* at the end of *165d* connects the idea that it is adequate to describe Trika as "half of six" with the next verse, where he justifies this interpretation by saying that it is not an arbitrary variant in order to keep the doctrine obscure, for if it had been, then other, more complicated, variants for *ṣaḍardha* should also be in use.

6.4.1 Yāmala

verses 167–168
For the conjecture in *168b*, see SANDERSON (1986), p. 186.

The author now reverts to a description of layers that are as it were inserted between the equilibrium of the powers that defines the Trika and the fivefold expansion. This gradation is reflected in the construction of the Trika's *maṇḍala* in which the Matayāmala is slightly below the Trika:

> "In the (Śaiva-)Siddhānta the throne culminates in the (nine) Powers of Gnosis. In the Vāma and the Dakṣiṇa schools it is extended to incorporate Sadāśiva. In the Matayāmala it rises above Sadāśiva to end in the Conscious (*samanā*). Here in the Trika it goes even further, ending only in the Transmental (*unmanā*)."[29]

28 See SANDERSON (1997) for a detailed treatment of the issue.
29 Translation of TĀ 15.319f as given in SANDERSON (1986), p. 181.

Matayāmala, as argued by SANDERSON,[30] stands for the *Picumatabrahma-yāmala*, an unedited Śaivatantra that survives in manuscripts:

> "This central stream of revelation is identified by Abhinavagupta as the Kaula, that mystico-erotic tradition which pervades the higher reaches of the Bhairava-teachings and has indeed expressed its relation to the Vāma and Dakṣiṇa by combining the goddesses of both in some of its rituals. The Yāmala-teachings (represented here by the *Picumata-Brahmayāmala*) fit perfectly into this hermeneutical 'rise of kuṇḍalinī'. For they are located by Abhinavagupta in this duality-devouring stream of the Kaula centre at the point at which the perfect fusion of Vāma, Dakṣiṇa and Kaula, claimed as its own by the Trika, is yet to be fully realized."[31]

6.5 The Five Faces of Sadāśiva

verses 169–171ab

The translation of *pṛthagbhāvaviyogāsu* may seem forced, but the first meaning that comes to mind for *pṛthagbhāva*, "separateness", would be redundant.

Among the names for the five powers *vidā* is just an infrequent variant[32] for *jñāna*, but *spanda* for *ānanda* is anomalous.

Having described the inclusive trinity of powers right from the beginning and having assigned a slightly lower slot to the Yāmala, the author now wishes to explain the transition from the non-dual cults to the "outside", i.e. to the pan-Śaiva model of the evolution of scripture characterized by the pentad of powers. He does so by emphasizing again and again that, although the pentadic form is somehow built into the structure of powers, their actual division involves more of the appearance of duality, a higher degree of limiting adjuncts (*upādhi*), and takes place on a much lower level of the universe. For the first time in the text our author identifies the five streams of the Śāstra with the five *mantra*s, i.e. faces of Śiva. In order to emphasize the structural principle on this layer of the universe he adds another pentad, namely that of the five *aṅgamantra*s.

---

30 SANDERSON (1986), p. 183f.

31 SANDERSON (1986), p. 186.

32 *vidā jñāne buddhau iti medinī*, see *Vācaspatyam*, s.v.

6.6 Īśāna

The lengthy section that follows is a characterization of the five faces, but interspersed with digressions.

verses 171cd–174ab

It starts with the Īśāna-face, which stands for the appearance of objects inside consciousness, but without a projection of duality. Since this face is directed upwards towards the light, its characteristic is that of dissolution. There is however a subtle activity of the power of action in it.

The purpose of the following verses is to differentiate this intermediate state from the manifestation of the levels below *māyā*. In contradistinction to *spanda*, which is defined as an indistinct vibration, the *sphāra* mentioned here allows of some activity, but is to be distinguished from the "normal" activity of the *kriyāśakti* in the "impure path" (*aśuddhādhvan*) of the universe.

174ab quotes MVT 1.26. See SANDERSON (1992), p. 300ff, for a detailed commentary on this monistic reading of the otherwise purely dualistic statement in the Tantra.

6.6.1 *Non-duality of Action*

verses 174cd–175

I have adopted J_1's reading in *174c* which gives the sequence *śuddha*, *śuddhetara* [= *śuddha* plus *aśuddha*] and *aśuddha*, and thereby avoids the awkward *aśuddhetara* of the K_{ed}. One could of course argue that this usage is elliptical and *śuddhetara* is more likely to be understood as equivalent to *aśuddha* rather than as a *dvandva*. This is not impossible: as the argument needs only examples of impurity, the "pure" could have been omitted and we might interpret *174c* as "intermediate (*śuddhaśuddhetara*) and impure (*aśuddha*)" by reading *śuddhetara* in *śuddhaśuddhetara* as equivalent to *aśuddha*. But I think the subsequent discussion and the *viśva* in *174d* point to the easier interpretation.

The last line is an attack on the Siddhānta model of creation, according to which Śiva is not in contact with the impure levels of the universe. There lower creation is initiated by a liberated soul, Ananta, who is vested with power and authority by Śiva. It is not possible to counter the Siddhānta in this point directly, as MVT 2.24cd–25 contains one of the classical formulations of this doctrine that is quoted even by dualists. But from the perspective of the nondualists the Saiddhāntika model is flawed, because it presupposes an influence of time on Śiva. The following verses are devoted to this topic by demonstrat-

ing that even in human experience there are instances where such a gradation cannot be accepted, and much less for Śiva, whose powers are incomparably vaster. This proves to the non-dualists that such a deism is untenable and the division into pure and impure ultimately invalid.

verses 176–179
The text is too elliptical here and I suspect a lost line after *176* that provided the verb.

The quotation in *177cd* is from the lost *Tattvārthacintāmaṇi* by Kallaṭa and appears also in the PTV and the TĀ.[33] In the context of the *Tantrāloka* our author tries to get a slightly different meaning out of the quotation. It occurs in a passage that describes the gradual obliteration of duality. In this process of meditative awareness of perception, differential thought (*vikalpa*) as well as the *tuṭi*s, i.e. the sixteen moments of a perception, decrease and the thought-free awareness of the perceiver emerges (TĀ 10.200). The entry into Śiva has only two *tuṭi*s, one correlated with the owner of the power (*śaktimat*) and one with power itself. One should concentrate on the second to gain omniscience and power to act (207), because the first is merely the full and undifferentiated consciousness, in which no objects and actions are possible (209). It thus transcends the world and is not useful for the Yoga of the Śaiva householder envisaged by Abhinava. For this concentration on the second *tuṭi*, he quotes Kallaṭa and understands *tuṭipāta* as the 'elapse of the [first] *tuṭi*', i.e. 'the second'.

Nevertheless the *api* introduced into the same quotation in the *Vārttika* and the hopefully simpler context lead to the straightforward interpretation for *pāta* as "duration". For a similar conception, cf. the description of *paśyantī vāk* in PTV, p. 4f: *na hi prathamajñānakāle bhedo 'trāsphurat*.

The verses up to *181* provide examples of non-duality in human perception. As *177ab* indicates, the examples are taken from areas where individuals can attain to such a perfection in human crafts or art that their attention to detail is fused into a single act of intuition.

In *178d* the meaning of *prakarṣati* and the comparison of the mind with a sword is not clear. From the examples that follow, we can infer that the mind is able to extract details of perception in "no time", but applied to the sword the image is difficult to interpret.

---

33 *yad āhuḥ śrīkallaṭapādāḥ tuṭipāte sarvajñatvasarvakartṛtvalābha iti*, PTV, p. 103. And TĀ: *tathā coktaṃ kallaṭena śrīmatā tuṭipātagaḥ | lābhaḥ sarvajñakartṛtve tuṭeḥ pāto 'parā tuṭiḥ* ||10.208||. DVIVEDA (1983a) adopts the reading from the PTV in his collection of citations from lost works, but Jayaratha's commentary (TĀV 10.208) has again a different reading: *yat tattvārthacintāmaṇiḥ 'tuṭipāte sarvajñatādayaḥ' iti* |.

verses 180–181

According to the definition[34] the figure involved "voicing the notes so rapidly that they appear as if merging", which in western terminology might be called glissando. I cannot say whether this is achieved on a Vīṇā as on a guitar by hitting only the first note on one string, but the point is, I think, clear: the trained musician is able to identify the scale in a virtuoso figure that lasts only "a moment".

For *dhārā* (*181a*) in the sense of "highest limit", see TĀV 29.2, where it is understood as *parakāṣṭhā*.

verse 182

The preceding examples can of course work only in favour of Abhinavagupta, if one accepts his proposition that the objective world exists in an undivided state before being projected outside. The first perception always takes place in one instant and contains all knowledge, which is subsequently – as in *176* – transformed into action. The side-swipe at the dualists is to be noted: the "non-dual reality" in most of the examples is something that can only be realized through becoming an "expert".

verses 183–185ab

For *yāvat* in the sense of "even", see APTE (1986), s.v.

pātañjali is an attested variant (MW, s.v.) required by the metre.

To demonstrate the point again and to elicit wider acceptance by adducing a sect-neutral acclaimed source, our author quotes *Yogasūtra* 3.33. This Sūtra stands at the end of a long section on the meditational techniques to be used for obtaining "magical powers" and proclaims intuitive knowledge as an alternative (*vā*) to the preceding techniques.[35]

What was described more as a Yogic technique is in Abhinavagupta's interpretation transformed into an ontological statement. The magical powers envisaged by the *Yogasūtra* (*vibhūti* or *siddhi*) are reinterpreted as the perfection of all things that appear.

---

34 The technical terms used here are to be found in the sixth chapter of the *Saṃgītaratnākara*, in the passage on *dhātus*. These are sounds produced by a certain right-hand technique (*prahāraviśeṣotthāḥ*) (6.125ab). After giving the subdivisions, the text goes on to describe the variety *vistāraja*, which "is called *ekavistāra* by other experts": *prahāralāghavāt kṛtvā svarān ekīkṛtān iva | vaicitryāt kvāpi viśrāntaḥ svaro vistārajo bhavet ||135|| ekavistārasaṃjñaṃ tam apare sūrayo jaguḥ* |. Another comparison involving a *vistāra* on a Vīṇā is to be found in *Haravijaya* 32.18.

35 See *Vyāsabhāṣya* thereon: *tena vā sarvam eva jānāti yogī prātibhasya jñānasyotpattāv iti*.

verses 185cd–187ab
It is an interesting feature of our author's theory of "supreme non-duality" that duality is not only included by a theoretical necessity, i.e. in order to explain the world we perceive, but that it also "adds" an aesthetic quality to an otherwise sterile absolute. This concept reflects on a philosophical level the notion of a God whose creation is for his own pleasure.

verses 187cd–188ab
Abhinavagupta provides us with several explanations of the word *sādākhya* in his commentaries on ĪPK 3.1.3.[36] The present context still describes Sadāśiva, whose mantra-body is the source of further differentiation and who therefore exists as intermediate between duality and non-duality. As creation through *māyā* has not yet taken place, there is only a slight activity of the power of action; the state is still a projection inside consciousness that is characterized by the power of cognition.

verses 188cd–190ab
The insertion of the *anusvāra* in *190a* solves two problems in this passage. It provides the predicate, and avoids the unnecessary qualification of the "great knowledge" as "arisen" (*prādurbhūta-*).

In a way this refers back to the objection raised in *24cd–25ab*, i.e. that differential thought, which is necessarily the basis of the Śāstra, excludes the possibility of scripture being directly grounded in God as the non-dual ultimate reality. The problem was first dealt with by expounding light (*prakāśa*) as being self-expressive, it is here repeated with reference to the intermediate state and it will be reasserted in *413cd*, where the author says that the sense of the Śāstra, up to its formulation in human language, exists in the highest God, the thirty-seventh *tattva*. *190ab* shows that the continuity of revelation down to lower forms of expression makes the Śāstra soteriologically effective.[37]

tad in *189b* must refer to *ūrdhvapada*, since the continuity of knowledge is emphasized in this passage. To understand *tad* as *māyā* would imply an influence of the lower on the higher, which our author would surely deny.

verses 190cd–191ab
The reading of K_{ed} in *191b* (*aśuddhādhvavidhāv iva*) would mean: "as if one's religious practise [were] in the impure [order of the universe]." But this is not

36 See TORELLA (1994a), p. 190, footnote 4.

37 *śivapradam* could be glossed as *śivatāpādanahetuḥ*.

meaningful in our context, as the line should give the reason why adherents of lower doctrines are excluded from true liberation in the next verse. Surely our author does not want to say that the Vaiṣṇava's religious practise is actually based on the *śuddhādhvan*, but rendered ineffective because they pretend to be based on the impure.

It makes more sense to assume that it is the failure of lower doctrines to recognize that the impure is not different from the pure and to pretend that their religious practise is based in and leads to a freedom from impurity. The attitude expressed in *191b* would therefore refer to their inability to transcend the dichotomy of pure and impure.

verses 191cd–194ab

The *niṣṭhita* in *191d* serves to emphasize that their true religious identity lies in these "lower" doctrines. Whatever the outer practise for reasons of social conformity may be, it is the internal practise that defines the true status of the practitioner.[38]

The syntax of the passage is odd. We would expect the construction to mean: "Just like those who are fixed in other doctrines [...] are not liberated completely, those who are consecrated as Śaivas too are not [liberated]." An unbiased reader would then deduce a difference between *śaivasaṃskṛta* and *parameśānaśāstre samyag dīkṣita* that would be accentuated by *tu*. It is however difficult to maintain such an interpretation; neither is *saṃskṛta* different from *dīkṣita*, nor is it possible to give *śaiva* a sense so different from *parameśānaśāstra* as would justify this interpretation.

The verses state the difference between the liberating Śaiva religion and the other religions that allow access to merely incomplete liberation. But within the truly liberating Śaiva religion there is a difference between the systems on which Abhinavagupta bases his exegesis ("our systems", i.e. Atimārga, Trika, Krama, Kula) and "other streams": the first strive for liberation in life, while the other can only promise final liberation at death.[39]

We see that Krama is mentioned here explicitly under the heading "Śaivism". This confirms SANDERSON's interpretation of *śaiva* as "one who follows the

38 Compare TĀV 4.25: "As he has internally resorted to it [i.e. the lower doctrine] he is based on it, and not [just] superficially in order to preserve the course of the world according to the rule "internally a Kaula, externally a Śaiva, but in daily life a Vaidika." *āśvastahṛdayatvāt tanniṣṭho, na punaḥ 'antaḥ kaulo bahiḥ śaivo lokācāre tu vaidikaḥ |' ityādinītyā lokasaṃgraharakṣāparatvena uttānatayā* [...].

39 See SANDERSON (1997) (fn. 1) on the question whether the whole or only parts of the Atimārga are promised final liberation.

system taught by Śiva", rather than "a worshipper of Śiva", for the second meaning does not apply to the Krama with its pantheon of exclusively female deities.

verses 194cd–196ab
The two verses contrast the author's systems, in which liberation in life is striven for, with the Siddhānta, whose reliance on complicated ritual makes this impossible.[40]

verses 196cd–197ab
I took *ata eva* in *196c* as referring back to the end of the previous verse and to mean that because the Saiddhāntikas eventually reach the highest fruit, their doctrine must reflect some of the characteristics of the higher, Kaula stream (*395ab*). *api* in *196d* is out of order (*bhinnakrama*) and refers to *saṃhāradṛśām*.

saṃhāradṛś, literally "one, whose doctrine is dissolution" could in the context (see below) refer to the method of unification with a series of gradually higher *tattva*s. This upward movement follows the "order of dissolution" (*saṃhārakrama*), that is, the lower levels are progressively dissolved in the higher. From the context it is clear that this must refer to the Siddhānta and the connection, which is not at all obvious, could be provided by the identification of the main deity of the Siddhānta, Sadāśiva, with *nimeṣa* in ĪPK 3.1.3.

kālapāda refers to the *Sārdhatriśatikālottaratantra*, a Saiddhāntika scripture commented upon by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (II).[41] The passage, which according to Rāmakaṇṭha deals with the *samayadīkṣā*, mentions an initiation that is based on the five elements as identified with the five *kalā*s.[42] After this identification follows the controversial statement (7cd):

> If you know this, o Mahāsena, you could even initiate outcastes.[43]

Rāmakaṇṭha interprets the line as follows: "The sense of 'one could even initiate outcastes' is hyperbolical. The sense of a verb connected to the word *api* signifies utmost[44] hyperbole, as in 'one might even split a mountain with one's

40 TĀ 37.27a shows that for Abhinavagupta the Siddhānta is characterized by an (over-)emphasis on ritual.

41 For the identity of this author, see GOODALL (1995), p. i–vii. For the interpretation, cf. SANDERSON (1986), p. 203, footnote 169.

42 Paṭala 8, verse 6–7: *nivṛttiḥ* = earth; *pratiṣṭhā* = water; *vidyā* = fire, *śāntiḥ* = wind; *śāntyatītā* = ether.

43 *taṃ viditvā mahāsena śvapacān api dīkṣayet* ||7||

44 Read *parā-* for *pare*.

head'. It is therefore impossible that this is the object of a precept.[45] It is therefore appropriate to explain [the phrase] 'one should perform initiation of foreigners, outcastes etc.' in the same way as one would explain (*vat*) the splitting of a mountain with the head, – which is not to be done by force, as in the interpretation of the masters of the Kula."[46]

As said before, Rāmakaṇṭha was probably an older contemporary of our author and his remark must refer to pre-Abhinavaguptian interpretations of this passage, but Abhinavagupta's omission of *api* could well be a response to Rāmakaṇṭha's attack on the Kaulas. This "Kaula perspective", namely that Śiva has hidden the true doctrine in the lower Tantras, appears for instance in Kṣemarāja's interpretation of *Netratantra* 10.11cd–11ab which ends a description of Bhairava with the following words: "This [form of Bhairava] has been taught in all Tantras, [but] veiled, not explicitly. My intention has not been recognized by anyone, [as it is] difficult to discern in the world."[47] Kṣemarāja then quotes the same passage from the *Kālottara* and adds: "Such secret doctrines [like initiating outcastes] would otherwise [that is, if they were not veiled] be despised."[48] From this inside view the omission of *api* in Abhinavagupta's quotation brings out the real sense that has been compromised by Śiva himself only not to upset the Saiddhāntikas.

6.6.2 *The Emergence of Duality*

verses 197cd–199ab

This verse seems to contradict the observation made in the commentary on 92, namely that *unmeṣa* is used irregularly for *cit*. We can only assume that this was not perceived as an inconsistency by our author, and that the meaning of *unmeṣa* as *cit* in 92 seemed as obvious to him as the meaning demanded by the present context.

Here *unmeṣa* is used to denote the second of the five powers, usually called *ānanda*, or else we have to understand *cidunmeṣa* as "the opening

45 In other words the passage, despite the optative, is no *vidhi*, but an *arthavāda*.

46 [...]*śvapacān api dīkṣayed ity atiśayārthaḥ* | *apiśabdopahitasya bhāvārthasya 'api parvataṃ śirasā bhindyāt' ityādāv iva pare 'tiśayapratipādanārthatvena vidhiviṣayatvāsaṃbhavād iti śirasā parvatabhedavan mlecchaśvapacādidīkṣaṇam atrāpi kartavyam eveti yuktaṃ vyākhyātum* | *na tu kulācāryair iva balāt kartavyam iti* || The translation of the last clause is rather free to bring out the polemical undertone.

47 *sarvatantreṣu ca proktaṃ pracchannaṃ na sphuṭīkṛtam* ||10.10|| *mamāśayo na kenāpi lakṣito bhuvi durlabhaḥ* |

48 *ityādyatirahasyam anyathā vyākupyeta* |, *Netratantroddyota* on 10.11ab.

of consciousness", which seems unlikely because we would then expect *cidādyunmeṣa*. More importantly, the first interpretation is confirmed by PTV on vs. 26 (p. 262), where the sequence is completed as *cid, unmeṣa, icchā, jñāna, kriyā*.

With this verse the three aspects of reality, namely non-dual, intermediate and dual are completed and the description of the other faces can proceed. Īśāna is the only face among the five that has been described before and its position is indeed ambivalent. On the one hand it stands for transcendence, as it is turned towards the "light" above,[49] but this exclusiveness is seen more as a defect, as it prevents liberation in life and cannot escape the dichotomy between pure and impure.

verses 199cd–200ab
In the comparison the *kaphasaṃcaya* resembles the *upādhi*s: if they are absent, the powers remain in non-duality which is their nature; if present they produce duality, but this change of function does not imply a transformation of their nature.

verses 200cd–201ab
The transmitted reading in *200c* seems to make sense at first sight, but for the answer (especially *201d*) to make sense the emendation is, I think, unavoidable.

The opponent cannot leave this peculiar concept of limitation unquestioned. The idea of "limiting adjuncts" (*upādhi*) suggests something that is external to and beyond the control of what is limited. For it to be effective, according to the opponent, requires that objects change under its influence. Limitation through *upādhi* cannot therefore take place in a reality that is like Śiva immutable even though identical with the world.

verses 201cd–203
The verb *upā-ruh* is used a few more times in this text (*234c*, *269a*). It occurs already in the phrase *pramāṇopāroha* in the *Vyāsabhāṣya* ad *Yogasūtra* 1.9, which might be the ultimate source for the same phrase in *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* 1 (p. 4).

iva in the sense of "a little" (APTE (1986), s.v.) is the lectio difficilior.

As mentioned above *201d* must refer to *viśvātmābhede* in the question. We can infer from the answer that the opponent tried to prove a division between Śiva and the world, and tried to do so by showing that the assumption of a non-

49 See TĀ 15.204c; discussed in the introduction.

division would lead to an inconsistency in the interpretation of *upādhi*. The argumentative structure of the question is therefore as follows: limiting adjuncts can only have an influence on reality, if we assume a division between Śiva and the world. This is of course strongly rejected by our author, but with an opaque argument (*202cd*). Assuming that "silent" means "inactive" here, we might interpret it in the following way: in the opponent's, i.e. the Saiddhāntika's, account of creation there is a division between Śiva and the world, that means, from the perspective of the non-dualists, that the Saiddhāntika's Śiva is not able to accommodate objects that undergo change. But as Śiva is an all-pervading reality, there must be a place of contact between the world and Śiva, and there – we must assume – the objects are miraculously inactive, if Śiva's nature is to remain unchanged. With the absurdity of the idea proven, the author can affirm the unsurprising solution: the ontological status of Bhairava, as we have seen in previous passages dealing with the Pratyabhijñā theory of *ābhāsa*, is radically different from manifestation and any influence of the manifested duality on the manifesting light is impossible. Therefore the reading of K_{ed} in *203d* has to be dismissed, as it does not provide an answer to the question in *200cd*. The answer cannot be the denial of *upādhi*s and duality as in the K_{ed}'s readings, but to show that all divisions are on the side of the appearances, and not on the side of the light.

verse 204

For the opponent the discrepancy between the appearance and its source as regards their qualities is not explained, unless one would regard the one as real and the other as unreal. But for Abhinavagupta reality *is* the appearance of God as a variety of forms.

verses 205–206ab

The opponent brings up a contradiction: if everything that appears is real, dreams too should be real, but dreams lack the causal efficiency that is characteristic of 'real things'. The author therefore ought to clarify his definition of reality and appearance. The issue is, however, not addressed here and the reader is referred to the section about dreams (*921*ff, *1000*ff). There the waking state is defined as the appearance of a variety of manifest forms, whereas in the dream state appearances are unstable. Despite their fundamental identity as appearance, causal efficiency is limited to the realm of duality, which means to externally perceived things.[50]

50 See ĪPV on 1.8.6 for details.

6.7 Tatpuruṣa

verses 206cd–207ab
unmeṣa is here as in *92* and *386d*, but unlike *197c*, used for *cit*! In *933a* too *pronmeṣa* seems to stand for *cit*, but there the case is even less clear, because *icchā* is not named and the series is used for a different argument, namely to describe the twelve Krama deities as an extension of the five powers.

In the present case the reason for the choice of words might be the image of "awakening", i.e. the arising of the light in the east, where Tatpuruṣa resides. The metaphor of light is used for the description of the directions that come into being with the five faces, but this light is – if we are allowed to extend the image – not the light of knowledge emitted by the moon, but the light of the sun, in which objects are manifested, until they dissolve, when the sun sets in the west (Sadyojāta).

verses 207cd–209ab
The author now tries to explain the name 'Tat-puruṣa' as 'its [i.e. the *īśvara-tattva*'s] perceiver'. The face is said to be "clearly recognizable", either because of the division between subject and object, or because it is the eastern face which is connected to the light. The details of this 'etymology' are however not clear.

It is noteworthy that neither of the usual sequences of the faces, the "vedic" starting with Sadyojāta, and the "vertical method" (*daṇḍabhaṅgi*) starting with Īśvara are used here. The logic behind this sequence is probably to show that Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta form a group against the remaining three, namely *ūrdhvordhva*, Vāmadeva and Aghora.

verses 209cd–210ab
Here the fact that the *Gāruḍatantra*s, which deal with the cure of snake-bites etc., are associated with the eastern face has to be explained, but the logical connection to the previous verse, expressed by *ata eva*, is not evident.

verses 210cd–211
The *Gāruḍatantra*s, which would have to be dismissed as lower scriptures of purely magical, or medicinal value, acquire metaphysical legitimation in this account: their ability to avert negative influences is reinterpreted as a stabilization of a creation that is always in danger of falling back into non-duality, just like children are more easily seized by the nine *graha*s.

verses 212–213ab
Following the dictum that the teacher should expound the contents of scripture Abhinavagupta does not provide us with the text, but only with a summary of MVT 2.60ab. The connection of this quotation with the Īśāna face may not be self-evident, but becomes clearer if we look at TĀ 9.310. There the same line from the *Mālinī* is quoted for a definition of "superiority" as implying "the state of pervading [the lower]" (*vyāptṛtā*). According to Jayaratha superiority is not a temporal or spatial category, but a gradation of quality. The higher is that which pervades the lower.[51]

6.8 Sadyojāta

verses 213cd–214
Although this could be taken as an answer to the question in *200cd–201ab*, it is part of the definition of Sadyojāta who is related to the power of volition (*icchā-śakti*).

verses 215–218
The idea of a disappearance of all objects in Sadyojāta is developed in order to explain the characteristic of a specific group of scriptures. We would expect that these refer to the *Bhūtatantra*s, but there is no indication for that. The only correspondence that is established here is that between Sadyojāta and *suṣupti*, – mediated by *icchā*.[52]

218 makes it clear that "disappearance" is only the "manifestation of disappearance" within the light.

verses 219–223
This short digression on reality, determinacy and the inconceivable power of God is perhaps motivated by the paradoxical description of Sadyojāta. It emphasizes the point that "unreal things" exist either as "real imaginations", or not at all, and that Sadyojāta's sleep is therefore only apparent.

---

51 The same quotation is used in a similar context by Kṣemarāja: *'yo hi yasmād guṇotkṛṣṭaḥ sa tasmād ūrdhvam iṣyate' iti sthityā ūrdhvā viśvotkṛṣṭā raśmayo yasya* |, *Sāmbapañcāśikā-ṭīkā* 9 (p. 7).

52 See commentary on *50–51* for the correlation of *suṣupti* and *icchā*.

6.8.1 Excursus: The Justification of Repetition

verses 224–229

Judging from the retaliation in *239* the *hanta* in *224cd* is probably polemical.

For *aucitya* (*226*) in the sense of "habituation", see PW which refers to *Kathāsaritsāgara* 24.95 etc.

janaḥ sa in *226b* could mean "you" as opposed to *ayaṃ janaḥ*, but the context demands a more general statement.

It is tempting to understand *augha* as "flood" and as referring to inundation, but *kṛṣ* ("plough, till") would then have to be taken very inaccurately as "cultivate".

aṅkurakandalaiḥ in *227a* could be understood as "sprouts and shoots", but the comparison with the plantain whose stem is considered to be "without essence" (*asāra*) is more appropriate here.

For *marmasthānam* in *226*, cf. TĀV 28.396.

The reader will welcome the lively interruption at this point. The opponent – here we might better imagine one of his disciples – accuses him of repetition and the response is a string of comparisons that aim at justifying the recapitulation of crucial doctrines. Mere repetition is of course rejected by our author (e.g. in TĀ 37.31).

229 A similar comparison, with devotion as the axe, is to be found in *Haravijaya* 47.31.

verses 230–234

Without the conjecture in *230b* the contrast expressed by *api* would be very weak indeed.

For the identification of *kapittha*, see MEULENBELD (1974), p. 536.

With verse *230* the author resumes the description of Sadyojāta. Although the *Bhūtatantra*s that are usually attributed to the Sadyojāta face are said to deal with exorcism, the actual description in *232–234* applies more to the otherworldliness of what might seem to be a Kāpālika, or perhaps Pāśupata, practitioner.[53] But in the system of the *pañcasrotas* the Pāśupatas (*atimārga*) appear as associated with Tatpuruṣa, and this takes places on a different level.

53 By the way, the stereotype *kapālamālābhāraṇa* occurs, for instance, in *Svacchandatantra* 9.31c. In *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa, pūrvārdha, 18.10a is is applied to the mothers. It could describe Aghora in *Netratantra* 9.24a, but there the matter is not so clear. If we assume that the verses are construed symmetrically, i.e. that two Pādas describe one face each in 9.23-25ab, then the attribute could indeed apply to Sadyojāta! On the other hand the text applies this description explicitly to Aghora in 10.4a.

Rather than referring to a specific group, this description seems to target *ascetic* Śaivism as opposed to the religion of the Śaivas in the world.[54] This would explain the critique that follows as an attempt to counter a possible objection to our author's yoga-based interpretation of the Tantra, namely that the domain of the Śaiva householder is not *yoga* or *jñāna*, but *karma*.

234d is marked by the editors of the K_{ed} with a question mark.

6.8.2 *Critique of* vairāgya

This critique of *vairāgya* is soon interrupted by a question, but taken up in the second Kāṇḍa of the *Vārttika*.

verse 235

There is a parallel in II,*110–111*, which attributes the idea to a "*guru*".[55] It seems to be a critique of the concept of detachment (*vairāgya*) and the corresponding yogic technique of *pratyāhāra*. Our verse summarizes the idea that an active withdrawal from sense objects, thought to be facilitated by pain, cannot be successful because the mental flux does not even in pain come to a standstill; on the other hand it rests and becomes detached even from a pleasant experience, if satisfied through the knowledge of the object. The conclusion in the parallel in II, *112* is that only a passive detachment can produce the falling away of mental activities. To try to actively "pull back" (*pratyāhāra*) from mental activity, only "cements" one's dependence on the mental flux. As mentioned by TORELLA,[56] the same idea is to be found in *Svabodhodayamañjarī* 12,[57] but one has to consider the possibility that the phrase goes back to MVT 3.6cd (quoted in ĪPVV III, p. 262).

verse 236

In this verse the author tries to adduce the *Yogasūtra* as support for the theory that knowledge is superior to detachment. *236* sums up *Yogasūtra* 1.15–16:

---

54 As SANDERSON has shown, Abhinavagupta's philosophy aims at the Śaiva householder, not at the ascetic (SANDERSON (1986), p. 202) and the higher levels of his Trika prohibit Tantric asceticism with its insignia, i.e. matted locks etc. (SANDERSON (1997), fn. 29)

55 See commentary on *22*.

56 TORELLA (1994b), p. 491.

57 *pūrvair nirodhaḥ kathito vairāgyābhyāsayogataḥ | ayatnena nirodho 'yam asmābhir upadiśyate ||*. Quoted with variants in TĀV 4.257. This small work has appeared in translation in GNOLI (1989), but the text is unfortunately not yet published.

dṛṣṭānuśravikaviṣayavitṛṣṇasya vaśīkārasaṃjñā vairāgyam ||1.15||
tat paraṃ puruṣakhyāter guṇavaitṛṣṇyam ||16||

The translation of the passage is tendentious in order to make Abhinavagupta's point clear, namely that knowledge (*khyāti*) is superior to detachment.

6.8.3 Excursus: The Motive for Creation

verse 237
The expression *yadi na kupyase*, lit. "if you are not offended", occurs in ĪPV 1.5.12 (vol. 1, p. 201).

Despite all efforts *237cd* does not yield any sense – J_1's reading is only accepted for metrical reasons – , unless one would emend it beyond recognition. One can imagine that an elaborate word-game on duality or division was the source for the corruption, and that *akāṇḍe* in Pāda c is perhaps wrong for *akhaṇḍe* (cf. TĀ 4.270a). The expression *khaṇḍanadāyi* in the answer would be in accord with this (*241*), but I would not hazard a guess at the reading.

verse 238
For *rasāt*, see commentary on *124*.

238c echoes the MVT's description of *rāga*: *rāgo 'pi rañjayaty enaṃ svabhogeṣv aśuciśv api* 1.28cd.[58]

Despite the problematic line the argument seems to be clear: the opponent cannot reconcile a mind searching for pleasure with an eternally immaculate consciousness.

verse 239
The author did not forget the accusation of repetition, made by the opponent in *224ab*, and sees his pedagogic approach justified.

verses 240–244
yoga is understood as "manner", "mode".

vipañcitam is not attested in the dictionaries, but might be glossed as *viśeṣeṇa (pra)pañcitam*. Cf. PTV p. 59: *tad eva asmābhiḥ vipañcitam iti* and *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa*, p. 88f.

The following passage tries to answer the objection made in *238*, which concerned the contradiction between the natural "desire" of consciousness for objects, which are by nature impure, and its own purity. In *241* Abhinavagupta

58 Adopting the variant in the edition; see also the quotation in TĀV 9.200ab.

emphasizes that the manifestation of duality in a non-dual reality does not bring about a division in the manifesting light itself. But in order to produce the appearance of duality, which is primarily the antagonism between the subject and the object of experience, the "power of Śiva" has to create lower states of consciousness, in which this duality can be perceived. Those states, i.e. consciousness as knowledge (*mitirūpā saṃvit*), naturally follows its objects, just like material forms are by nature inclined to dissolve into the elements from which they originated.

verses 245–246ab
A general example to explain why consciousness, because of its fullness, has the natural tendency to flow into lower states. The same idea is quoted in II, *100–101*, but no source for the quotation is known.

verses 246cd–247ab
The opponent seems to accept the natural flow towards objects, but not its selectiveness. If this selectiveness is not due to any external influence, but to its own determination, it would follow that consciousness is necessarily connected to desire.

verses 247cd–248ab
Abhinavagupta cannot deny this, but phrases his acceptance very carefully, and then reinterprets this peculiar kind of *rāga* as merely the toleration of the influence of something else, rather than a *desire for* something.

6.9 Sadyojāta (continued)

verses 248cd–251ab
The opponent tries to stir up another contradiction, but the author is suddenly reminded of his main topic and goes on to explain the western face of Sadāśiva in the terminology of the process of perception. The passage describes how consciousness becomes contracted and is gradually emptied of all the parts involved in the process. The completion of it leaves the consciousness in a void similar to the state of dissolution at the end of a *kalpa*. This is then linked to Rudra, the deity presiding over the resorption of the universe (*saṃhāra*).

verses 251cd–252
At this point the author provides us with an overview of the correspondence

between the causal deities (*kāraṇeśvara*) and the five faces in order to show that the description of Rudra refers to Sadyojāta. The future tense (*bhaviṣyati*) indicates that Vāmadeva and Aghora are still to be described.

The emendation of the transmitted reading *kajo* is based on the required sense "Brahmā". Abhinavagupta uses *abjajaḥ* (TĀ 26.2) for Brahmā, which does not help here except that it proves that he does not hesitate to play with words. To assume an error for *kajī* – which would be formed analogous to *sarojin*, which is attested as an epithet of Brahmā – is paleographically conceivable and furthermore restores a *ra-vipula* from a Pathya Śloka.

This would lead to the following set of identifications:

Sadyojāta	Rudra
Tatpuruṣa	Īśvara
Īśāna	Sadāśiva
Vāmadeva	Viṣṇu
Aghora	Brahmā

If we compare this list with the one given in the introduction, we note a transposition of Rudra and Brahmā. Since the identification of Sadyojāta with Rudra is corroborated by the wider context and cannot be due to textual corruption, we cannot but assume that our author has altered the identification, to which he in other places adheres,[59] to fit his context. That this should be done with such an important category is remarkable.

In the present context the use of these deities has notable implications. As the set of *kāraṇeśvara*s sometimes includes *anāśrita* as the sixth, the identification hints at the correctness of the highest, sixth "stream" (*srotas*) above Īśāna. It is perhaps also a way to suggest that *in a sense* Sadāśiva, who represents the Śaiva-Siddhānta, is not the deity that – as in the Siddhānta model – encompasses the whole canon through its five faces, but that Sadāśiva's scope is really that of the Īśāna face, and that the other faces are open to a different exegesis, namely that of the Trika. In other words, to confine Sadāśiva to the upper face is to limit the influence of the dualistic Siddhānta to a part, which is

59 Cf. *Bṛhadvimarśinī* III, p. 309: *tata eva brahmahṛdayo viṣṇukaṇṭho rudratālur īśvarabhrūmadhyaḥ sadāśivordhvabrahmarandhro 'nāśritātmakaśaktisopānoparipadaḥ kāraṇaṣaṭkavigrahaḥ parameśvaraḥ*. Here the sequence of causal deities corresponds to the normal sequence of faces beginning with Sadyojāta (see introduction). Five causal deities are mentioned here in *254*, *Sārdhatriśatikālottara* 23.9cd–11 and *Netratantra* 7.23. Compare also *Somaśambhupaddhati*, Nirvāṇadīkṣāvidhi, 233–236, and the list in BRUNNER-LACHAUX (1977), Appendix XI.

– as we have seen in the interpretation of *165* – excluded by the definition of the Trika. Another indication of the tendentiousness of Abhinavagupta's interpretation here is that the sequence of the five faces will culminate anomalously with Vāma and Aghora – the two faces that are part of the *ṣaḍardha* and therefore the most important for him in the context.

verses 253–255ab

The required sense forces us to understand *anya* in *254a* elliptically as *anyatama*.

Here the word *brahman* is explained in a way which reflects the capacity of these five faces or powers to remain internally undivided (*199ab*), while displaying division on the outside. The image of the five-faced Sadāśiva is thus expressive of this differentiated, but undivided structure, and the doctrine that every face contains all five powers, but emphasizes only one, is reflected in the notion that each of the five faces is again fivefold (*378*). This doctrine may also account for the fact that a clear correlation between one power and one face does not emerge from this text.

In *254* the five causal deities (*kāraṇeśvara*) to which these five faces correspond are introduced and their name explained as the 'causes' for the predominance of one of the five powers in every face.

verses 255cd–257

The complicated description in *256* possibly attempts to circumvent the objection that the state of *rudra*, being described as "contraction", i.e. the absence of manifestation, could play any role in this stage of creation.

The quotation in *257* is ĪPK 3.2.1: "Such being the structure of reality, Rudra is the deity that presides over the state in which this subjectivity exclusively subsists; Brahmā and Viṣṇu reside in the flowing of the differentiated cognizable reality."[60]

With the passage inserted by K and J_{Σ} the following – metrically correct – text would result:

> *bhinnaprameyetyādyaṃ ca nāṃtaḥ kiṃtu kadācitke* |
> *bhrama ityādi tacchrīmadutpalena nyarūpyata* ||

60 *tatraitanmātṛtāmātrasthitau rudro 'dhidaivatam* | *bhinnaprameyaprasare brahmaviṣṇū vyavasthitau* || The translation is TORELLA's. See also his notes on the verse in TORELLA (1994a), p. 197.

Although *bhrama* is certainly a corruption of *brahma*, I am unable to emend this into a meaningful sentence, which makes the question whether to include this passage less relevant.

verses 258–259
One will find Śaiva interpretations and *nirvacana*s for Sadyojāta that analyse the name as *sadyo-'jāta*,[61] but also *sadyo-jāta*.[62] In the present context, Abhinava reads first *jāta* and then *ajāta* through repetition.[63]

As indicated above the idea of an existence of contraction inside manifestation needs special emphasis, as the more natural result of contraction would be the resorption of manifestation. Here the state of Sadyojāta, although 'contraction' by nature, has to exist in order to interact with the other faces in the production of scripture.

6.10 Vāmadeva

Having dealt with the Īśāna face, which despite being the "highest" is devalued by its inability to include the lower, and also with the eastern and the western faces, which are "without essence",[64] the author now turns to the remaining two faces, i.e. Vāmadeva and Aghora.[65] The next ten verses (*260–270*) seem to describe Vāmadeva, but their internal logic often remains opaque.

verses 260–262ab
viśvaṃ sthitam: the universe in its *sthiti*-phase, which corresponds to Vāmadeva. The emphasis on *sthiti* is corroborated by *263cd*.

verses 262cd–265
The identification of emptiness with the state of deep sleep (*suṣupti*) prompts a short anticipation of the passage on the five states of consciousness, i.e. waking, dream, profound sleep, the 'fourth' and the one 'beyond the fourth'. For details, see the passage starting with *921cd*.

---

61 Compare also the name *ajaḥ* for Sadyojāta in *Mṛgendratantra*, Vidyāpāda, 3.8, and *ajāta* in *374a*.

62 *sadyaḥ tatkālam eva jātam*, Rāmakaṇṭha on *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, kriyāpāda 3.62.

63 Compare his double interpretation of *Śivasūtra* 1.2 in TĀ 1.26f, which goes back to Kallaṭa.

64 According to Jayaratha (TĀV 1.18), see introduction, p. 29.

65 On the *vāmasrotas*, see SANDERSON (1986), p. 212–214.

verse 266
The second *vibhuḥ* is probably corrupt; perhaps we ought to read *prabhuḥ* instead.

verse 267
This verse shows that each of the five faces is not simply correlated to one of the five powers. There is indeed an emphasis on one power in a specific face – according to the table given in the introduction Vāmadeva should be linked to *ānanda* and this is certainly the background for *275* – , but an emphasis of one in an organic, integrated whole. The pentad of powers works in each face and for this reason each face is again fivefold. I suppose that the author would justify this with the *sarvasarvātmakavāda* that he has already mentioned (cf. *132*, *253* and *378*).

verses 268–269
This explains that the experience of void prevalent in Sadyojāta prevents the differentiation of being and non-being etc. The conjecture in *269b* is based on the quotation in the next verse.

verse 270
The source is Utpaladeva's *Ajaḍapramātṛsiddhi* 1: *yathā sadasatāṃ naiva viśeṣo 'sti nijātmani | jaḍājaḍānām apy evaṃ nāsty asāv iti niścayaḥ ||*

verses 271–272
In *271b* one Śāradā mistake can lead to the opposite sense: J_1's reading *vimṛṣṭa* could mean "becoming conscious of own and other [and thereby obliterating it]". But *cidanuprāṇanā* is more naturally connected to supporting differentiation. Cf. ĪPV, vol. 1, p. 242: *iti tadanuprāṇitā vikalparūpatā.*

verses 273–274
vāmaḥ in *274d* could mean just "adverse to", but the preceding two lines suggest this more witty interpretation.

6.10.1 Vāma as Beauty

verses 275–277
Here the general characteristic attributed to the "left stream", i.e. the technique of attraction in erotic magic, is reinterpreted as an expression of the aspect of

ānanda and *saubhāgya*. Elsewhere (TĀ 38.27d) Abhinava talks of this stream as being interested mainly in magical powers.

verses 278–279
This describes the desire for appropriation as the main focus of meditation in the Vāma.

The *na* transmitted in all the sources in *279b* does not make sense, but is an understandable scribal error.

verse 280
The introduction of the quotation by *tathā* evokes suspicion about its authenticity. The *tathā* – with or without the following verse – would have to be a comparatively old insertion, since all sources transmit it. But more important than the decision to retain or dismiss the verse, is the question as to its source: it occurs in the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* (4.46), which is sometimes thought to be not necessarily later than Abhinavagupta, but a work of which he was not aware. The historical implications of this quotation might lead one to argue that this is one of the "floating verses" which appear in different works, but until more works which actually contain it are brought to light, we must assume a direct quotation. The possibility of the verse being interpolated in the *Vārttika* does not solve the problem, as our author quotes it again in the *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa* (p. 229)[66] and adapts it in TĀ 5.94cd–95.

DVIVEDA had tried to defend the theory that Abhinava knew the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* by referring to the phrase *nityātantravidaḥ* in TĀ 28.123, whereas GOUDRIAAN thought that Abhinavagupta did not refer directly to this text.[67] In the introduction to the second edition of his *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* DVIVEDA reaffirms his conclusion by presenting more evidence: "It is now established beyond doubt that during Abhinavagupta's time the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* was a well-known work, as he mentions not only the 'knowers of the Nityātantras', but also quotes from the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* [the verse starting] *kāmena kāmayet* in the explanation called Tattvaviveka as well as the phrase *e-okāragataṃ bījaṃ*."[68] If we take into account Jayaratha's mention

66 See GNOLI (1985), who refers to the *Vārttika*, translates *281–283* and provides further interpretation.

67 GOUDRIAAN AND GUPTA (1981), p. 60.

68 *abhinavaguptena na kevalaṃ nityātantravida eva smṛtāḥ (upo. pṛ. 8), api tu parātriṃśikāyās tattvavivekākhyāvyākhyāne (pṛ. 229–230) tena nityāṣoḍaśikārṇavasya 'kāmena kāmayet' (4.46) iti, 'e-okāragataṃ bījaṃ' (1.100) iti ca vacanam api smaryata iti nūnaṃ tasya samaye grantha eṣa prasiddha āsīd ity atra nāsti vivādasyāvasaraḥ* |, p. *kha*.

of a long commentarial tradition on this Tantra,[69] one can only agree with DVIVEDA. More intricate is the question, why this text is quoted by Abhinava in the *Vārttika* for the explanation of the *vāmasrotas*. Was it seen to be a comparatively recent text that – despite propagating a pantheon that is quite different from Abhinavagupta's religious world – inherited material from the almost extinct *vāmasrotas*, such as this peculiar exegesis of *kāma*? This could at least explain why Abhinava quotes this Tantra, whose position in the Śaiva canon is marginal, "being known in this canon only to itself".[70]

The two earliest commentaries on this text that survive are the *Ṛjuvimarśinī* by Śivānanda and Jayaratha's *Vivaraṇa*. The verse in question is introduced with the assertion that merely by knowing this practise the mantra-practitioner is transformed into Kāma. Śivānanda then interprets the cryptic verse as describing the *yantra* of Kāmarāja and assigns its five parts, i.e. *kāmasthaṃ*, *kāmamadhyasthaṃ*, *kāmāṅkuśapuṭīkṛtam*, pāda c and pāda d, to the five *bījas* of Kāmarāja: *hrīṃ klīṃ aiṃ blūṃ strīṃ*,[71] which express the five forms of Kāma (*kāma, manmatha, kandarpa, makaradhvaja, mohana*).[72]

verse 281

This reinterpretation of a key term of this system of the left stream is intended to show that "desire" – from the higher perspective of the Trika – describes not a technique to gain magical powers, which according to Abhinavagupta is the main aim in this part of the tradition, but in fact only an aspect of the all-encompassing process of perception: the appropriation and enjoyment of the object.

---

69 SANDERSON (1990a), p. 157.

70 SANDERSON (1990a), p. 157.

71 *athānyaṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi prayogaṃ bhuvi durlabham* ||44||
yena vijñātamātreṇa sādhako madanāyate |
[Ṛjuvimarśinī:] *atheti* | *anyaṃ mahāphalam* | *durlabhaṃ śaktipātavihīnānām* | *yena prayogeṇa vijñātamātreṇa gurumukhāl labdhamātreṇa, anuṣṭhānaṃ vinety arthaḥ* | *sādhakaḥ adhigantā* | *madanāyate svayaṃ kāmo bhavatīty arthaḥ* || *śrīkāmarājayantram āha kāmastham iti* | *atra bījapañcakaṃ veṣṭanaṃ sādhyaṃ koṇaṣaṭkaṃ cakraṃ ca kāmaśabdenocyate* | *bījapañcakaṃ tāvat hrīṃ klīṃ aiṃ blūṃ strīṃ iti* | *kāmasthaṃ kāmarūpeṇa hrīṃkārātmanā sthitaṃ yad bījaṃ tat* | *kāmamadhyasthaṃ kāmasya klīṃkārasya madhye sthitam* | *kāmodarapuṭīkṛtam uktaṃ tad etad bījadvayaṃ kāmasyaiṃkārātmanaḥ ṣaṭkoṇarūpasyodareṇa puṭīkṛtam* | *kāmena kāmayet kāmam iti* | *atra dvitīyāntaḥ kāmaśabdaḥ karmavyutpattyā sādhyam abhidadhāti* | *tat sādhyaṃ* .... DVIVEDI's edition notes a reading *sādhayet* for *kāmayet*.

72 See *Artharatnāvalī* on the verse.

verses 282–283ab
In the *Netratantra* (11.8) the *kiṃkaras* are part of the pantheon of Tumburu, i.e. the form of Śiva worshipped in the *vāmasrotas*.

verses 283cd–285ab
I am not sure whether my conjecture in *284a* is beyond doubt, but the transmitted reading, i.e. "one pervades the body consisting of *prāṇa* and subtle body", is even more doubtful. The of *tattva-* in *284c* is also suspicious.

verses 285cd–286ab
The text now turns to an explanation of the four powers that are present in the pantheon of Tumburu.

verses 286cd–287
It is clear that the four powers of Tumburu are reinterpreted in this passage as partly congruent with the standard set of five powers, but the *-vidikriyāḥ* in *288b* poses some problems. *vidi* is the form of the root in the *Dhātupāṭha* (*vidi jñāne*) and a more natural translation would have to understand *vidikriyā* as the "act of knowing".[73] But as four powers are demanded by the context, *vidi* must stand for knowledge and *kriyā* for action. *unmeṣa* again must stand for *cit*, while *ānanda* could be symbolized by Tumburu in the centre of the pantheon.

Furthermore the inconsistency in the iconographical description of Tumburu mentioned by GOUDRIAAN[74], namely the anomalous five-headed Tumburu in the *Netratantra* (11.3), can be explained – on a theoretical level – with Abhinavagupta's theory of Tumburu being the fifth in the middle of four powers, but being subdued by them.

verses 288cd–289ab
We have seen above that the transition from one face to the other is nowhere clearly indicated in the text; there might be an intention behind this apparent lack of structure, namely to suggest that the five faces of Śiva form a single indivisible process: the five powers are a dynamic whole, which is differentiated only through shifting preponderance. From this perspective the present verse can be interpreted as describing two aspects of the nature of Śiva: his nature as Vāma, i.e. as connected to four powers, as well as Aghora, whose nature is to obliterate prior differentiation and who therefore does not really allow a "count-

73 See TĀV 3.133cd.
74 GOUDRIAAN (1985), p. 53.

ing" of these powers. Formally the verse is a connecting verse typical for our author.[75]

6.11 Aghora

It has been mentioned above that the sequence in which the five faces are introduced starts with those that play only subordinate roles in the Trika; ending the sequence with Aghora emphasizes the segment of the canon that deals with Bhairava and is therefore nearest to the Trika.

In the following account of the southern face, Abhinavagupta argues as follows: since Aghora is related to the non-dualistic Śāstras, the power that manifests this face, i.e. the power of action, is interpreted as that which nullifies prior division, thereby conforming to his description of non-duality as a rejection of duality. The aspect of resorption inherent in this concept accounts for the destructive practices prevalent in this part of the tradition,[76] but its fundamental structure, namely the "uprooting of duality" shows also that it is superior to the others.

We might add another thought: the doctrine of unification through action that our author expounds in the sequel can also serve to explain the working of ritual action. Unlike the Siddhānta the Trika has the problem that in order to explain how initiation can produce the liberating unification with Śiva, it has to reinterpret action as producing or embodying knowledge. But if the power of action necessarily leads to unity, ritual action too, besides expressing the underlying unity of the factors of action, will lead to this unity.[77]

verses 289cd–292ab
The qualification "carefully" (*sādaram*) indicates that we are not dealing with outright destruction, but as with a controlled fusion.

verses 292cd–294ab
The "subtlest power" is *cit*.

parāvadhau, lit. "in the highest limit". The transmitted reading *purāvadhau* is meaningless.

The description of *kriyā* evokes the image of a ferocious emaciated goddess

---

75 See p. 52.

76 *dakṣiṇaṃ raudrakarmāḍhyaṃ* TĀ 37.27c.

77 See also SANDERSON (1995), p. 48–49.

that is eager to devour the offerings made by the devotees and becomes full in the process.[78]

6.11.1 Unification Through Action

verse 294cd

The question prompts a discussion on action (*–308ab*) and its agent (*308cd–346ab*); the main thread is taken up only in *347*, where Aghora is identified with the *kriyāśakti*. Abhinava's position that the power of action corresponds to the non-duality inherent in the Bhairava scriptures of the southern stream – indicated subtly in *289cd* – is now restated and defended.

verses 295–300ab

The author counters by adducing a grammatical parallel,[79] namely the status of actions as expressed in verbs. There is a discussion of this in Kauṇḍinyabhaṭṭa's *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra*:

> "With this in mind it is stated in the Vākyapadīya – see there – that 'the activity (*bhāva* = *kriyā*) described with verbal endings is non-existent'. And this activity [cooking by default] is said to be diverse in form: blowing [?the fire], heating [the pot] from below and effort. For it is proven by experience that the knowledge of those diverse [activities] is [understood] from the sense of, for instance, the verb 'to cook'. And this [manifoldness] does not entail a multiplicity of meaning."[80]

This proves for our author that not only in language, but also in reality, action has the power to unite objects. But in *296cd–297ab* he wishes to go further by saying that this fact of daily experience and of grammar is only explicable if we assume a single reality of which these constituents are interdependent parts. The problem posed by objects with different natures becoming one through action therefore cannot occur; action only makes manifest the underlying unity. In *297cd–298ab* the opponent introduces the view that "cooking" is just the name

---

78 Cf. the quotation in *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* 8.

79 For grammar being the model of many philosophic argumentations in the Pratyabhijñā, cf. TORELLA (1987).

80 *...etad evādāya 'asattvabhūto bhāvaś ca tiṅpadair abhidhīyate' iti vākyapadīyam iti draṣṭavyam | ayaṃ ca vyāpāraḥ phūtkāratvādhaḥsaṃtāpanatvayatnatvāditattadrūpeṇa vācyaḥ | pacatītyādau tattatprakārakabodhasyānubhavasiddhatvāt | na ca nānārthakatāpattiḥ*, *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra*, p. 2.

given to a variety of disparate actions, but their convergence in a single purpose is enough for Abhinavagupta to deny this.

300ab "For the same reason" refers to *297ab*.

verses 300cd–301ab

The opponent disagrees with the theory of unification through action and adduces the example of perception, in which different causes are involved that do not become one during the process.

verses 301cd–304ab

Our author emphatically rejects this view and shows the inconsistency in the opponent's argumentation: in order to explain action we cannot but assume that the difference between, for instance, the faculty of sight, the lamp and the mental process is ultimately unreal. If they were separate entities, no single result could ensue from their cooperation.

verses 304cd–308ab

This concludes the discussion of the power of action.

6.11.2 The Agent

verses 308cd–309ab

Starting from the assertion that Śiva is not divided by the results and agents of actions, the opponent raises a question on the concept of the limited agent in contradistinction to the universal agent Śiva: Even if we accept that Śiva's power of action unifies objects and thereby destroys division, it is not clear how the limited agent, i.e. consciousness identified with a body, relates to this process.

verses 309cd–310ab

Without the emendation to *iti* the sentence hardly makes sense. I take *iti* to mark the repetition of the opponent's phrase "*kathaṃ paśavaḥ kuryuḥ*". For Abhinava the question is evidently self-contradictory and therefore rejected.

verses 310cd–311ab

The creation of an earthen pot is one of the stock examples used in Indian logic to discuss causation, especially to distinguish the efficient ('potter') from the instrumental cause ('clay').

verses 311cd–312
The *api* in *311d* is, I think, out of order (*bhinnakrama*) and refers to "the potter".

As the sequence of the three lines as transmitted in all manuscripts does not follow the logic of the argument, I have moved what seemed to be the conclusion to the end. One other slight oddity in the text as transmitted, namely the position of *nanu* at the beginning of a line, but after a first line of objection, can thereby also be resolved.

If it is only the identity of the agent with Śiva that is effective in causation, all individual causation is only Śiva's causation. The opponent now reverses the argument and says that if it is this non-difference of the potter with Śiva, then the potter would partake of universal causation and would in a sense also be the agent in the production of a cloth,[81] and therefore everything else, as Śiva is the cause for everything.

verse 313
After this preparatory argument follows a serious objection: The law of *karma*, i.e. the future effect of actions on their agent, would be rendered invalid by this theory.

verses 314–315
This describes our author's concept of *karma* and at the same time immunizes his position against any objection: there is in fact no result of past actions, but only for those who have this insight. In other words, objections are useless, because those who do not understand this theory are indeed bound by *karma*.

This is a side-swipe against the Saiddhāntika, who maintains that in order to be finally liberated at death, the initiate has persevere in his daily observance in order to nullify the *karma* that is incessantly building up.[82] His life after initiation is seen merely as the rest of his *prārabdhakarma*, which continues like a potter's wheel, but is destined to come to an end.[83]

The dualistic Śaiva-Siddhānta explains the unliberated state with the concept of *mala* – an impurity conceived as a substance that has to be removed by initiation –, with *māyā* and its products, whereas Abhinavagupta's interpretation of *mala* is based on MVT 1.23cd which defines *mala* as ignorance.[84] Accord-

81 Weaving is another craft adduced as an example for creation.

82 There are of course exceptions, like the *nirbīja-dīkṣā* for those who are incapable of performing *samaya*, but this seems to be more a social compromise than a convincing extension of the doctrine.

83 See SANDERSON (1995), p. 40f.

84 See TĀ 9.68ff. and 13.41cd–128. For the dualist's concept of *mala*, see Rāmakaṇṭha's com-

ing to his school this "impurity" (*mala*) falls into three parts, *āṇava-*, *kārma-* and *māyīyamala*, which means that both *māyā* and *karma* are reinterpreted as a form of ignorance.

verses 316–318ab
Abhinavagupta here describes and refutes the theory of an inactive, merely experiencing consciousness whose "agentship" is only apparent. For our author this would contradict the nature of consciousness, but the opponent steps in by adducing the Sāṃkhya doctrine of an active *prakṛti* that binds the inactive soul. I understand this as a philosophical pattern introduced by a Saiddhāntika who, when talking of *prakṛti*, means *māyā*, which in his dualistic system is different from Śiva.

verses 318cd–320
By rendering *vṛthā* not adverbially ("wrongly"), but rather freely as "nonsense', the translation intends to capture the cumulative effect of the intensive *jegīyate* ("to assert obstinately"), *vṛthā* ("wrongly") and the derogatory description of those who adhere to this doctrine as misguided. The force of *gṛhe* is not clear to me (perhaps "privately"?).

In TĀ 10.46–50 Abhinavagupta allows a metaphorical interpretation only if there is a real entity or quality to which the metaphor refers.

verse 321
I suppose that *parigīyate* implies "taught in the Śāstra".

verse 322
As far as I can see the verse only makes sense if we understand *prayojana* in the sense of *prayoga*.

verse 323
The second line is possibly corrupt, at least not understood by the present author. In the first pāda the transmitted text is unmetrical; without an intelligible second half the conjecture is of course extremely tentative.

verses 324–325
Here the opponent, or a disciple, offers a solution for the dilemma of an active self thought to be identical with an inactive God.

---

mentary on *Kiraṇatantra* 2.11ff, see GOODALL (1995), p. 149ff.

verse 326
This verse might be directed to his young students, but could also be just the usual insult of the *pūrvapakṣa*.

verses 327–329
In other words, a differentiation in these three qualities is not sufficient to account for individual agentship, because these three qualities always coexist as potentials.

In translating this set of question and answer (*328–329*), I took *nanu* as an indicator for the question; but *328* could also be the objection, weakly indicated by *kiṃ*, and *329* the answer. *329* would then run smoothly into the next verse, but leave *nanu* as introducing the answer – which is very unlikely.

verses 330–334
Abhinavagupta now reduces activity to a quality of knowledge pertaining to God. The conjecture in *332b* is only an attempt to get some sense into these difficult verses.

verses 335–338
This is a short discussion of various theories which are then rejected. In *338*, for instance, the possibility that the self is the agent not by virtue of its own activity, but by manifesting universal agentship through its qualities, is briefly mentioned.

verses 339–340ab
This, however, would conflict with the theory of liberation. If the presence of those qualities alone would be sufficient to experience the result of actions, then – given the pervasiveness of the selves – a liberation from *karma* is not possible, as their presence in other selves would be enough for a reappearance of *karma*.

verses 340cd–342ab
From here on follows the author's conclusion. If God is the ultimate cause for every part of a complex process that seems to have its own causes, nothing remains to be done for the individual agent.

verses 342cd–344ab
The universal causation by God extends even to the minute details. This conclusion, derived from the Pratyabhijñā doctrine of manifestation and of God's

absolute autonomy, leaves nothing to do for the individual. *343cd* could also be read as another attack on the Siddhānta concept of indirect causation through Ananta.

verses 344cd–345ab
It is of course impossible to say whether the Śāradā manuscripts used for the K_{ed} actually read the *avagraha* in *344d*, but *'bhede* would not serve the argument.

This settles the question on *karma* that was raised in *313*. There is no indvidual soul that could independently of God create *karma* or be influenced by it!

verses 346cd–347
The author finally takes up the main thread of argumentation by identifying the power of action with the southern face (Aghora).

parā in *347b* could also mean that the *kriyāśakti* or the Aghora-face is identified with the *parāśakti*.[85]

verse 348
Here the fact that Aghora is directed to the South is "explained" with the second meaning of the word *dakṣiṇa*. The second line is not clear to me.

verse 349
The opponent, probably accepting the previous argumentation, wonders whether anything can ever become an agent. But for Abhinavagupta, who seems to understand *bhāvāḥ* as "beings" rather than just "things", this is the starting point for a description of the liberated state.

verses 350–352
In order to put the doctrines connected to this face into the right perspective the following passage has to show how this power of the southern face is responsible for liberation and is therefore appropriately called "non-terrifying" (*aghora*) and "kind" (*dakṣiṇa*).

verses 353–354ab
This is a quotation of MVT 3.33. There the powers of Śiva that are "not terrifying" are attributed to the goddess Parā. In the preceding two verses in the

85 See commentary on *396*.

MVT the terrifying powers had been attributed to Parāparā and the "extremely terrifying" to Aparā.

verses 354cd–355ab
The quotation is of *Spandakārikā* 48, which is also quoted in TĀ 13.266. The idea is also used in Kṣemarāja's *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya*, Sūtras 11 and 12.

For Abhinavagupta the emphasis must have been on '*jñātā*' to which I have therefore in the translation subordinated the other attribute '*svamārgasthā*', – which, by the way, is omitted in the parallel (TĀ). For the different interpretations of the commentators on this verse, see DYCZKOWSKI (1992).

6.11.3 Phonematic Emanation

The power Parā mentioned in *354* is not only one of the three powers of the Trika,[86] but also a name for the highest form of speech (*parā vāk*). In his attempt to associate the power of action, the goddess Parā and the highest level of speech, Abhinava now proceeds to give an account of the "great creation" (*mahāsṛṣṭi*), i.e. the creation that starts with the Sanskrit alphabet.[87]

verses 355cd–357ab
The transmitted reading is metrically faulty and an emendation to *kroḍīkṛtau* seems to be the only way out.

The first creation that appears when the power of action "opens up" is the Sanskrit alphabet in its normal order (*mātṛkā*),[88] i.e. from *a* to *ha*. This happens on the highest level of speech (*parā vāk*), where a differentiation of letters has not yet taken place and they therefore appear only in an abbreviated form. This indistinctness expresses itself on the phonetic level through the grammatical rule of contraction (*pratyāhāranyāya*) according to which the combination of the first (*a*) and last letter (*ha*) of a series encompasses all that lies in between. The lack of differentiation in this contraction is expressed by the *bindu*, the dot that represents the *anusvāra* and is interpreted as the undifferentiated reality. "By resting in the *bindu*" the first articulation or awareness of sound is that of "I" (*a-ha-ṃ*).

86 See SANDERSON (1990b).

87 See PADOUX (1990), Chapter 5: Phonematic Emanation, and especially p. 306ff.

88 See TĀ 15.115cd–120c for the ritual placement of this series of letters onto the body (*nyāsa*).

verses 357cd–365ab

In this passage the importance of the Śāstras created from this face is emphasized through the complexity of its description.

One might consider to emend *bhava* in *362a* to *abhāva* in order to add a fourth state of absence of both fullness and emptiness.

vāmācāra in *364d* is translated as "transcendence" according to a definition given in TĀ 15.278, where the practitioner is enjoined to perform the ritual with the impure left hand, "as it goes against *saṃsāra*" (*saṃsāravāmācāratvāt*), which is explained by Jayaratha: "The [practice with the left hand] is opposed to the world of transmigration, excluded by the world and therefore a secret practice conducive to liberation."[89]

The point of *saṃkalpasatyabhāva* in *364ab* is not clear to me.

verses 365cd–366ab

My restoration of the verse with three conjectures can only be called tentative, but *e* and *o* in Śāradā are easily confused and the *tra* in *trasta* can be explained as dittography.

The verse asserts that the religious practice based on this phonematic emanation inherits the main quality of the *kriyāśakti* described above: its power to overcome duality.

verses 366cd–368ab

This "great creation" (*mahāsṛṣṭi*)[90] is not on the same spatial and temporal level on which all processes of creation and resorption are supposed to take place. To interpret it only as the first creation, i.e. one preceding 'normal' *sṛṣṭi*, is thus not correct.

verses 368cd–370ab

The correlation of Aghora with the *kāraṇeśvara* Brahmā, which – as we he have said above – is anomalous, concludes the description of the five faces as identified with the five powers and the five *kāraṇeśvaras*. The series starting with Īśāna/Sadāśiva and ending with Aghora/Brahmā is the following:[91]

vaktram	*kāraṇa*	*śakti*
īśāna	sadāśiva	jñāna

89 *vāmaḥ saṃsāraviparīto lokabahiṣkṛto muktyanuguṇo rahasya ācāraḥ.*

90 See PADOUX (1990), p. 306ff.

91 See the tables in the introduction and *252*.

tatpuruṣa	īśvara	cid
sadyojāta	rudra	icchā
vāmadeva	viṣṇu	ānanada
aghora	brahmā	kriyā

verses 370cd–373

See *80* for the quotation from his own *Bodhapañcadaśikā*.

Section 7
The Three Divisions of the Śāstra

verses 374–375ab

The following section, which concludes the first chapter of the *Vārttika* on the *pañcasrotas* (i.e. *15–399*), has been excerpted by Jayaratha in his commentary on TĀ 1.18.[1]

The editors of the K_{ed} of the *Vārttika* supply a short explanation that is based on Jayaratha with *374*.

What follows is a description of how the divisions of the Śaiva canon come about on the lowest level of speech, where we can finally talk about texts; even if they are still taught by deities to other deities and not yet "brought down to earth" by *avatārakas*. The first group of texts is the so-called Śiva division, ten texts which are attributed to specific combinations of the five faces: (1) Īśāna emerged, (2) Īśāna emerging, (3–6) Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta emerged and emerging, (7) the three together, (8) Īśāna and Tatpuruṣa, (9) Īśāna and Sadyojāta, (10) Sadyojāta and Tatpuruṣa.

This arrangement also explains why these three faces are excluded from consideration in the Trika (*ṣaḍardha*). As they stand exclusively for duality, their scope is too limited to be integrated fully into the non-dual schools.

verses 375cd–376ab

J_{Σ}'s reading in *376b* ("in the division called Śiva") is equally possible.

verses 376cd–377

As we have seen the three faces Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta represent duality; the combination of these with the left and the right face therefore produces a group which is supposed to teach a doctrine that is intermediate between dualism and monism.

---

1 Translated in the introduction p.28ff.

If we ignore the interpretation in TĀ 1.18 for the time being, we seem to have three groups of six. The most straightforward interpretation is to form groups of two by combining Vāmadeva and Aghora with the three faces mentioned before. The three groups can be formed, similar to the description of the *śivabheda*, by three states of emergence. I concede that *-udbhavaiḥ* in *377b* contradicts this interpretation, but I cannot see another way of forming three groups of six. Instead of resorting to more complicated interpretations one might consider emending boldly *-udbhavaiḥ* to *-bhūtakaiḥ*.

The problem with this verse is that it cannot be brought in line with the description that Jayaratha gives of the *rudrabheda*, a description that is presumably based on the *Pūrvapañjikā*. I do not think that there is a problem of consistency; our author, for instance, describes the stages of *ānanda* differently in the TĀ and the second Kāṇḍa of the MVV without losing a word on the discrepancy. But if the assumption that the *Pūrvapañjikā* was an earlier work that was partly superseded by the *Vārttika* is correct, then the fact that Jayaratha's explanation is based only on the earlier source is noteworthy.

verse 378

Jayaratha's testimony gives interesting readings, but in this case, where it is likely that they stem from another text that might have had a slightly different version of the same verse (i.e. the *Pūrvapañjikā*), conflation should be avoided.

Cf. SANDERSON (1990b), 12.34–39, for the idea.

verse 379

I doubt that the transmitted reading *nāpunaruktatā* ("nothing that has not been said before") in *379d* can be made to yield sense in this context. Jayaratha states in a slightly different context that there is *no* repetition in the combination of faces, and I cannot see what our author should have meant by the opposite.

verses 380–382

I have taken the repetition in *anyānya* (*380a*) as indicative of a distributive sense, rather than in the normal sense of "mutually" etc.

The passage emphasizes that the whole Śaiva Śāstra is valid, i.e. leads to true liberation. But as we have seen in *194cd–195ab* there are differences as to whether this is accomplished directly, that is during one's lifetime, or gradually and slowly through further stages. For *380d* compare the passage quoted in TĀV 13.303: *yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve śivadhāmaphalapradāḥ*.

The position of this affirmation immediately after the Śiva- and the Rudra-division is intentional: the scriptures that follow, i.e. those associated with

Bhairava that are supposed to teach non-duality, naturally lead to Śiva, but at this point it is again emphasized that also the non-ultimate doctrines of the dualistic and other Śaiva Śāstras must eventually lead to Śiva, because they are taught by him.

verses 383–384

Bhairava facing south (i.e. symbolizing death) expresses the characteristic of Aghora/*kriyā*, which is to destroy duality, through his colour. To use a modern image, he is the "black hole" into which *māyā*, i.e. the appearance of an external world, is resorbed.

verse 385

The quotation is from *Vijñānabhairava* 85: "All space which rests in the heart one should contemplate as Bhairava. Into all that which is the reality of the splendour of the form of Bhairava one should enter."[2]

In his commentary on this verse Śivopādhyāya quotes the *Vārttika*, but includes in his quotation two lines with the *nirvacana* of the word *liṅga* that cannot be traced.[3]

It is impossible to say whether there were in Śivopādhyāya's times records of different states of the text, or – if the hypothesis of the *Pūrvapañjikā* containing a prior version of this doctrine is true – a conflation of both texts. In any case it seemed advisable to base the edition on the evidence of the manuscripts only.

It is probable that Abhinavagupta, like Śivopādhyāya, wanted to understand *mūrdhni* in *385c* as "heart", as the Aghora-mantra itself ("*oṃ huṃ aghorahṛdayāya namaḥ*") contains the word.

verse 386

Pādas a and b are quoted from the *Vijñānabhairava* (verse 85). The metrical fault in pāda a appears in both editions of the text and is ignored by

---

2 *līnaṃ mūrdhni viyat sarvaṃ bhairavatvena bhāvayet | tat sarvaṃ bhairavākāratejastattvaṃ samāviśet ||*

3 *līnaṃ gamayatīty ukter liṅganirvacanaṃ yataḥ |*
hṛdaye brahmarandhre ca viyal līnaṃ pare pade ||
[*383cd–384* follows]
iti mālinīvārttikanītyā sarvaṃ jagat mūrdhni mukhyabhūte hṛdayabrahmarandhrākhye, viyat ākāśarūpaṃ timirarūpaṃ vā, antaḥkṛtasarvabhāvaparipūrṇaṃ, sarvasaṃhārakatvāt kālarūpaṃ ca akāśamayam eva cintayet, tadanu tasya sarvasya bhairavākṛtiparaprakāśatattvasamāveśaḥ | sarvasya uktalakṣaṇakṛṣṇarūpatvacintanena paraprakāśātmatā adbhūtaṃ phalam | tejastattvaṃ citprakāśarupaṃ samāviśet arthāt yogī iti | eṣā prāguktaśūnyabhāvanāvikalpanā āṇavī bhūḥ ||

the translators (SILBURN and SINGH). Since the verse that follows in the *Vijñānabhairava* starts also with *evam eva*, but is metrically correct, we have to assume a corruption in the manuscript tradition of the Tantra. This must have spread through scribal 'correction' to the manuscript transmission of the *Vārttika*. As I assume that Abhinavagupta did not hold metrical faults as an acceptable feature of Tantric language, both the archetype of the Tantra and of the *Vārttika* should have read something which completes the ra-vipula – which is frequent in this Tantra. On the other hand there is another unmetrical passage in the *Vijñānabhairava* (77b) which cannot be explained away easily.

Śivopādhyāya interprets *durniśāyāṃ* as a night with clouded sky.

verse 387

This verse is obviously meant as a condensation of the techniques mentioned in the *Vijñānabhairava* that can be quoted in favour of Abhinavagupta's description of the darkness of Bhairava. The general idea seems to be based on the "meditations" in this Tantra, but the details are open to interpretation.

verses 388–389

The preceding passage was apparently intended as an explanation for the idea that in this process of dissolution the four faces lose their differentiating potential and can only give rise to non-dualistic scripture.

verse 390

The sixty-four Bhairavatantras are formed by multiplying the sixteen mentioned in the preceding verse with these four aspects, the source of which is not known.[4] *yugapat* indicates that these scriptures are beyond time and duality.

verses 391–392

391a contains a metrical fault that could be averted by reading, for instance, *śambhu* for *śiva*, or *śarva* (in order to avoid conflict with *392*).

The *tathā ca* in *392b* is transmitted in only one manuscript of the Kashmirian edition of the text and should be secondary according to SRINIVASAN's rule 1.4.5.11.[5]

The author has now completed this account of the structure of the canon, that is, the descent from the higher level of speech, which is the Trika's own, to the

---

4 Jayaratha's treatment of the same passage in his commentary on TĀ 1.18 does unfortunately not clarify the terminology.

5 See SRINIVASAN (1967).

fivefold reality which finally culminates in the Aghora face, furthermore the creation of concrete scriptures from those five faces, and the three-fold classification of those scriptures. The Trika, according to the preceding description, is more or less a special combination of the Aghora, the Vāma and the highest (*ūrdhvordhva*) face. But this is not enough for Abhinavagupta. For him the Trika subsumes even the Siddhānta, and this forms the topic of the few verses that conclude this chapter. The threefold division of the Śāstra into Śiva, Rudra and Bhairava, i.e. the state in which the utmost diversification of doctrine takes place, suddenly reduces the pentad to an underlying trinity. In other words, even on this comparatively external level the reality is that of the Trika rather than the Siddhānta. It is then only logical that the Trika cannot remain higher than and in antagonism to the Siddhānta, it must incorporate it as a lower level.

verses 393–394ab

This connects with verses *50* and *20cd* by alluding to the equilibrium of these three powers in the highest stream. There are other ways to understand *vibhinna*, but the most likely interpretation is that the pentad of the Siddhānta is only an extension of the Trika, whereas the latter remains a scripture of greater essentiality for the specially qualified.

verses 394cd–395ab

As we have seen in *160* the Trika was conceived of as a combination of three streams out of six, namely the "uppermost" (*ūrdhvordhva*), the Vāma and the Dakṣiṇa. Here the fusion of the three results in the Kaula that has absorbed the characteristics of the "left" and the "right": "The essence of all the Tantras [i.e. the uppermost], when resting on the left and the right and fusing into one, becomes the Kaula [level] in the Trika."[6] There is also evidence that this is a description of "ritual reality".[7]

verses 395–397

The reading of TĀV 1.18 is exceptionally accepted in *396ef* because it avoids the redundancy of *-trayaṃ/-tritayaṃ*.

The verse is a description, not of the basic structure of the Trika as *ṣaḍardha*, but of the deity Triśirobhairava, which obviously encompasses not only the left and right stream, but also Īśāna! We can only speculate on the background of

---

6 *aśeṣatantrasāraṃ tu vāmadakṣiṇam āśritam | ekatra militaṃ kaulaṃ śrīṣaḍardhakaśāsane* || TĀ 37.27.

7 SANDERSON (1986), p. 186, fn. 84.

this doctrine; possibly it is meant to account for peculiarities in the worship of Triśirobhairava in the lost Tantra of the same name.[8] Jayaratha notes that the Triśirobhairava is a *samānatantra* (TĀV 4.251), which can only mean that it is on a lower level *of the Trika*, a level which accomodates even the Siddhānta? Was the deity Triśirobhairava worshipped with the three heads Īśāna, Tumburu and Aghora?

Apart from the reason mentioned above, the reading accepted from TĀV 1.18 contains a more plausible attribution of powers, for *aparā*, which symbolizes duality, should stand for Īśāna and Parā for Aghora (*dakṣa*), not vice versa.

verse 398
This verse is the conclusion drawn from *396*. If Bhairava, i.e. the Kaula deity, encompasses the three powers that correlate to *ūrdhva*/Īśāna, Vāma and Dakṣina, then those scriptures are rooted in the Kaula stream and eventually lead to the goal as defined in this essential Śaivism, namely the freedom from duality and contraction.

The details of interpretation are however less straightforward: judging from the context *kula* is used here as scripture of the Kula. As Tantras and Kulas are mentioned, it can only mean that Tantras denote lower scriptures and Kula "higher" ones, but it is not clear whether "Tantras" means only the Siddhānta scriptures, or includes those of the Vāma and Dakṣiṇa stream. Judging from the use of the word in one passage of the *Jayadrathayāmāla*[9] the latter seems more probable. For the use of the word, compare also *Śrīkaṇṭhī* (prose passage following on verse 5).

verse 399
The first chapter of the *Vārttika* ends here with the quotation of the word *jñānacandra* from MVT 1.1., thereby implying that the preceding chapter was an explanation of the implied meaning of these two words.[10]

---

8 It appears from Kṣemarāja's commentary on *Svacchandatantra* 2.25 and his commentary on *Netratantra* 10.1–10ab that the *Triśirobhairavatantra* belonged to the *dakṣiṇasrotas*.

9 *vāmadakṣiṇatantrā ye akulāni kulāni ye | sauragāruḍā ye proktā advaitadravyasaṃbhavāḥ* ..., quoted in SANDERSON (1997).

10 Cf. TĀ 13.348 *trikārthavijñānacandra*.

Appendices

Appendix 1
The Śrīkaṇṭhī

The following appendix is a transcript[1] of the singular fragment of this important text which was discovered by Prof. SANDERSON in the *Nityādisaṃgraha*[*abhidhānapaddhati*].[2] In the Paddhati the text is called *Śrīkaṇṭhī*; Kṣemarāja uses the same name,[3] but also *Śrīkaṇṭhasaṃhitā*[4] and *Śrīkaṇṭhīyasaṃhitā*.[5]

For several reasons I have not tried to edit the text: most of the names of Tantras in the many lists cannot be verified easily, and the characterization of scriptures are, without access to the texts that are described, difficult to follow. Even the emendation of corrupt passages is on insecure grounds, because there are more original "*aiśa*"-forms[6] than in some of the parallels. In other words, if one focusses on the text of the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* itself, there is the dilemma that, in order to understand the text, parallels are needed that are more "correct", but the more correct may still be secondary.

Before an edition can be attempted it is therefore necessary to compare the lists with parallels. For the list of the twenty-eight Siddhānta-Tantras this has been done by GOODALL (1995), and for the sixty-four by SANDERSON (forthcoming).

For the present purpose, that is, to understand the possible influence of the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* on Abhinavagupta's philosophy, a transcript and a table of contents will nevertheless be instructive, even if the text remains partly unintelligible. Although I have not been able to trace a direct quotation from this text by

---

1 This appendix is based on the results of a reading group in Śaiva manuscripts formed by Dominic Goodall, Harunaga Isaacson, James Mallinson, Judit Törzsök and the present author, during which a transcript of the first 150 verses of this text was prepared.

2 The manuscript is Ms. Stein Or. d. 43, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

3 *Svacchandatantroddyota* 9.109, 10.255 and 11.61.

4 *Stavacintāmaṇivivṛti* 84; *Svacchandatantroddyota* 10.3–5.

5 *Śivasūtravimarśinī* on Sūtra 2.1; *Svacchandatantroddyota* 8.29.

6 There is undoubtedly original hiatus, secondary sandhi ("*vedeti*" 8c), wrong gender ("*bhedāni*" 184a, 327a/c) etc.

Abhinavagupta, we must assume that it was known to him, since his successor Kṣemarāja quotes it for its description of the *pañcasrotas*.[7]

7.1 Summary of Contents

1–5 The expression of knowledge as sound.

6–7 Seventeen forms of expression of this sound. The prose passage preceding verse 5 list only sixteen: Veda, Vyākaraṇa, Tarka, Itihāsa, Purāṇa, Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva, Saura, Bauddha, Ārhata, Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Siddhānta, Kula, Kaula, Akula.

8–15 The Veda and its corresponding deities and elements, its correlation to the faces, and to the parts of the syllable "oṃ".

16–19ab Grammar. Definition of the word *vyākaraṇa* and a list of nine grammars.

19cd–25ab Tarka. Details not clear.

25cd–34 Several topics: Itihāsa (25c), Pāñcarātra (29d).

33–38 Smṛti, i.e. Purāṇa. List of eighteen Purāṇas.

39–43 Yoga

44–51ab Sāṃkhya

52cd–69 Pāñcarātra. List of 116 Pāñcarātra-Saṃhitās.

70–88 The division of the canon of Tantras taught by Sūrya.

89–101 Several topics. Definition of Kula and Kaula in 99–101; the quotation in TĀV 29.4: *kulaṃ śarīram ity uktam* is perhaps of 99a!

102–103 Vs. 96: *śaktipāta* and *dīkṣā*; vs. 97: *prasādamantra*. The division of the Śaiva canon into ten and eighteen is mentioned in 102; thereafter, in verse 103, the chapter on the seventeen-fold *śabda* is concluded.

104–107 Here the five streams are described as the source of revelation. A list attributes the different kinds of knowledge, i.e. worldly, vedic etc., to the five faces. See introduction, p. 14.

---

7 Commenting on the word *pañcamantramahātmanā* in *Svacchandatantra* 8.29 he says: *pañcamantramahātmanety anena śrīkaṇṭhīyasaṃhitādyuktanānāsrotobhedaḥ sūcitaḥ | tatra*

> *adṛṣṭavigrahāc chāntāc chivāt paramakāraṇāt |*
> *jñānarūpaṃ viniṣkrāntam anavacchadanaṃ mahat ||* [=1]

ityādinā nādasvarūpaṃ nirūpya

> *tato jātam idaṃ sarvaṃ caturvargaphalapradam ||* [=5]

ity uktvā srotobhedena nānāśāstraprapañcodayaḥ pradarśitaḥ |

108–112 List of the twenty-eight Siddhānta-Tantras. See GOODALL (1995), p. 228 and 233, for an analysis of this passage with all early parallels and an edition.

113–125 Here the twenty-eight Tantras are described as coming from parts of the body of Śiva. For an edition of this part of the text with the help of a parallel in the [*Pauṣkara*]*pārameśvara*, see GOODALL (1995), p. 230–31. The readings of the *Pārameśvara* are only given here where the text of our manuscript is clearly wrong.

126–151ab Several topics: *tarka, saṃbandha, bheda, artha, pakṣa.*

151cd–155 The twenty-eight Gāruḍa-Tantras.

156–166 Subdivisions of the Gāruḍa-Tantras.

167–200 20 Bhūtatantras (167cd–169) (with further characterization).

201–219 Verse 201 seems to start a section on *pātālakhaṇḍa*, but it is not made clear how this segment fits in. Is it perhaps related to the *pātālabheda* (see vs. 317)? The passage that follows would speak for such an interpretation: not only is the *picumata* mentioned here, also the definition of Kulas (205–207ab) and Kramas (207ff) points to the "secret" lower face. Against this interpretation stands vs. 219, where it is said that "this western face has summarily been taught".

220–247 24 Dakṣiṇatantras.

248–270ab 24 Vāmatantras.

270–285 Sixty-four Tantras of the *sādāśivaṃ cakram*. The list is quoted in TĀV 1.18, but with several discrepancies.

286–328 The last portion contains a list of eight plus one "Kaulas" (309–311), and an important statement for our purpose in 315–317, where it is said that the system of six streams, namely the five plus the lower, is superior to the five streams. This conclusion, namely that the Śaiva revelation consists of six stream is reiterated in the penultimate verse (327).

श्रीकण्ठ्यां तु विशेषेण यथोक्तमुपदिश्यते।

अदृष्टविग्रहाच्छान्ताच्छिवात्परमकारणात्।
ज्ञानरूपं विनिष्क्रान्तमनवच्छदनं महत्॥ १॥

कारणत्वं यदा प्राप्तं सोर्कत्वेति अनाहतम्।
क्षरते यत्परं यस्मादक्षरस्तेन कीर्तितः॥ २॥

यो ऽसावचिन्त्य इत्याहुः प्राणिनां प्राणधारकः।
चिदात्मा सर्वगः स्वस्थः स्वसंवेद्यो निराश्रयः॥ ३॥

जन्तूनां हृदयाब्जस्थो वदते नादरूपकः।
आगोपालाङ्गना बाला म्लेच्छाः प्राकृतभाषिणः॥ ४॥
जलेचराश्च ये सत्त्वास्ते ऽपि नित्यं ब्रुवन्ति तम्।

नादरूपं हकारं तु हंस हंसेति सुव्रते।
तदुत्पन्नमिदं सर्वं चतुर्वर्गफलप्रदम्॥ ५॥

अथातो वेदव्याकरणतर्केतिहासपुराणवैष्णवशैवसौरबौद्धार्हत सांख्ययोगसिद्धान्त-कुलकौलाश्चाकुलान्यपि

एवमादिकभेदैस्तु शब्दब्रह्म प्रतिष्ठितम्।
तथान्यैर्बहुभिः शुभ्रैर्नामभेदैरनेकशः॥ ६॥

एते भेदाः सप्तदश मुख्यत्वे कीर्तिता मया।
तेषां भेदं प्रवक्ष्यामि शुद्धविद्यागमोद्भवम्॥ ७॥

अनन्तमुखनिर्यातमागमोदितवर्त्मना।
वेदेति प्रथमं यच्च तच्चतुर्धा प्रकीर्तितम्॥ ८॥

ऋग्वेदः पृथिवी ब्रह्मा आपो विष्णुर्यजुः स्मृतः।
रुद्रस्तेजो भवेत्साम वाय्वीशो ऽथर्व उच्यते॥ ९॥

In this transcript lacunae in the ms. are marked with ⊔, illegible characters by †.
1d अनवच्छदनं conj.] (=SvTU) अनच्छवदनं ms. 4d तम् conj.] तत् ms. (see Sārdhatriśatikālottara 1.6cd–7ab) 6d अनेकशः conj.] अनीकशः ms.

अध्यायानां सहस्रेण ऋचां लक्षैरनेकशः।
असंख्यैः शास्त्रसामान्यैर्बहुमन्त्रादिपूरितैः॥ १० ॥

यज्ञविद्यासहस्रैश्च साङ्गोपाङ्गादिसंयुतः।
मत्प्रसादजवक्त्रेण ऋग्वेदमवतारितम्॥ ११ ॥

ततश्च व्याकृतं शास्त्रं कालान्तरनिमित्ततः।
अथर्वं दक्षिणं वक्त्रं गुह्यमन्त्रालयं शुभम्॥ १२ ॥

ऋग्वेदं पूर्ववक्त्रं तु शब्दब्रह्मप्रवर्तकम्।
स्मार्तं सर्वाङ्गसम्पूर्णं क्रियाभेदादिसङ्कुलम्॥ १३ ॥

पश्चिमं साममित्युक्तं च्छन्दोध्ययनभूषितम्।
हकारं हंसरूपं च हौति हायति गीयते॥ १४ ॥

यजुऋक्सामवक्त्रस्थं तच्चतुर्धा तु पठ्यते।
अकारश्च उकारश्च मकारश्चार्धमात्रकः॥ १५ ॥

शैववैदिकशब्दादीञ्शब्दार्थप्रतिपत्तये।
प्रयोजननिमित्तं च धातुशब्दानुशासनम्॥ १६ ॥

व्याकरोति यदा सर्वं तदा व्याकरणं स्मृतम्।
नवधा तच्च विज्ञेयं कालान्तरनिमित्ततः॥ १७ ॥

ऐन्द्रगालवशाकल्यगार्ग्यवात्स्यकृतं तथा।
कात्यायनभरद्वाजगुहात्रेयकृतानि च॥ १८ ॥
नव व्याकरणान्येवं सर्वशब्दार्थकारणम्।

प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणार्थप्रमाणं चाष्टधा यथा॥ १९ ॥
वाच्यवाचकसम्बन्धमनुमेयादिलक्षणम्।
लिङ्गाल्लिङ्गीति सामान्यं धूमादग्निर्घनात् स यः॥ २० ॥

दृश्यो द्रष्टा तमोरूपो जन्मी जनयिता यथा।
शुष्कतर्कादिसत्तर्कनिमित्तो निरहेतुकः॥ २१ ॥

17cd–19ab inserted from margin ms. 21d तर्कादि conj.] भर्कादि ms.

भ्रमः परोक्षसामान्यं प्रत्यक्षमविनश्वरम्।
अर्थापत्तिप्रमेयश्च सम्बन्धो निरहेतुकः॥ २२॥

निमित्तकारणस्तर्कः क्षणभङ्गी परोक्षतः।
ज्ञानमात्रादिसम्बन्धसदबुद्ध्यादिलक्षणः॥ २२॥

ज्ञानमात्रमिदं सर्वं यथावद्भावहेतुकम्
निर्निमित्तानि रूपाणि निमित्तो निरहेतुकः॥ २३॥

हेतुः प्रत्यक्षसामान्यः प्रमेयश्चार्थसिद्धये।
पुनर्भवो ऽस्ति नैरात्म्यं निःस्वभावादिलक्षणम्॥ २४॥

बौद्धे प्रत्यक्षसामान्यमेतदष्टविधं मतम्।
इतिहासादिकं विष्णोः सनिमित्तमहेतुकम्॥ २५॥

स्थित्यादिलक्षणं सर्वमाध्यात्मिकमतः परम्।
क्रियादिलक्षणं सर्वमुपास्योपासकाकुलम्॥ २६॥

प्राकृतं व्याप्तिनियमं कर्मयोगादिलक्षणम्।
सर्वत्रात्माधिकृत्यैवं स्वसंवेदनलक्षणम्॥ २७॥

प्रवर्तते सनिमित्तं निर्निमित्तं निवर्तते।
तत्सर्वं वैदिकेयं तु ⊔ दं ब्रह्म गीयते॥ २८॥

यज्ञक्रियादिकर्तव्यं गुणस्रोतादिसम्भवम्।
कर्मसंन्याससम्बन्धं पाञ्चरात्रिकलक्षणम्॥ २९॥

तदुद्दिश्य तु कर्माणि भवन्ति न भवन्ति च।
इज्यापादानकं कर्म स योगः पञ्चधा मतः॥ ३०॥

सालोक्यतां तु प्राप्य ⊔ परमात्मादिसम्भवः।
आयुःपिण्डः स्वतेजोक्तो हन्यमानो यथा जवात्॥ ३१॥

विस्फुलिङ्गानि मुमुचे तद्वद्भूतादिसम्भवः।
केषांचिदावेशमात्रं स्थितं मण्डूकचूर्णवत्॥ ३२॥

28a सनिमित्तं conj.] सन्निमित्तं ms. 29c संन्यास conj.] सन्यास ms.

इदं कार्यमिदं नेति इदं कृत्वेदमाप्नुयात्।
आप्तोपदेशसम्बद्धमस्तीति वस्तुगौरवम्॥ ३३॥

ब्रह्माद्यैरनुमंस्ये यत्तत्स्मार्तमिति गीयते।
पूर्वजैः पूर्वत ⊔ कृतमित्येवानुष्ठितम्॥ ३४॥

सर्गानुसर्गवंशाश्च मनुमन्वन्तरस्थितिः।
वंशानुवंशचरितं पुराणमिति कीर्तितम्॥ ३५॥

तच्चाष्टादशधा वक्ष्ये ह्यवतारकभेदतः।
आद्यं ब्रह्माण्डमित्युक्तं द्वितीयं वायुरुच्यते॥ ३६॥

म ⊔ णं तृतीयं चतुर्थं सूर्यसम्भवम्।
पञ्चमं विष्णुसंज्ञं च षष्ठं विद्यासमुद्भवम्॥ ३७॥

सोमाख्यं साम्बसम्भूतं भैरवं विजयं तथा।
इत्यष्टादशभेदेन पुराणं परिकीर्तितम्॥ ३८॥

चित्तस्य वृत्तिस्तत्त्यागः साक्षात्कारादिलक्षणम्।
आत्मना सह संयोगः संयोगः षड्विधो मतः॥ ३९॥

प्राणायामस्तथा ध्यानं प्रत्याहारश्च धारणा।
तर्कश्चैव समाधिश्च षडङ्गो योग उच्यते॥ ४०॥

वाचकस्तस्य ओंकारो हृच्छायी पुरुषेति च।
क्लेशकर्मविपाकाद्यैरपरामृष्ट ईश्वरः॥ ४१॥

उपलब्धिप्रमाणार्थधारणाज्ञानहेतुकः।
उपास्यो ज्योतिरूपश्च तल्लवः परिणामकः॥ ४२॥

पातञ्जलानामित्यादि मतमात्मविनिश्चयः।
घ्राता स्पर्शयिता वक्ता ज्योतिरात्मेति योगिनाम्॥ ४३॥

साध्यानां संख्यया ज्ञानं पञ्चविंशात्मकं न हि।
पृथिव्यादीनि भूतानि शब्दाद्या भूतयोनयः॥ ४४॥

33cd °सम्बद्धमस्तीति conj.] °सम्बद्धमास्तीति ms.

अन्तःकरणं त्रित्वेति कर्मबुद्धीन्द्रिया दश।
प्रकृतिस्त्रिगुणा देवि पुरुषः पञ्चविंशकः॥ ४५॥

स च कर्तेति भोक्तेति संयोगात्फलमश्नुते।
निष्पत्तिः पङ्गुरन्धेति अयस्कान्तो मणिर्यथा॥ ४६॥

स्फटिकः सूर्यतेजेन तद्वद्भूतविनिश्चयः।
विपर्ययाद्गुणानां तु पृथग्भोक्तृत्वकर्मतः॥ ४७॥

बहूंस्तत्त्वान्प्रसिद्धांश्च इति मानप्रमातृतः।
अयसः समरे नित्यं प्रकृतिस्थो न मुच्यते॥ ४८॥

प्रधानपुरुषान्तरं दृष्ट्वा प्रकृतिकेवलः।
अकर्ता भोग्यनिष्पत्तौ लोष्टवदनुकेवलः॥ ४९॥

सन्तः सांख्यविदामेवं प्राकृतं मतमुच्यते।
पुरुषान्न परं किंचित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः॥ ५०॥

यदेतत्संख्यया ज्ञानं त्रिप्रमाणमुदाहृतम्।
शतकोटिप्रविस्तीर्णं पाञ्चरात्रं प्रमाणतः॥ ५१॥

तत्र भेदशतं पूर्णं षोडशाधिकमेव च।
विष्णुना कथितं देवि पञ्चकालनिदर्शनम्॥ ५२॥

नामभेदेन वक्ष्यामि संहितानां समासतः।
नारायणी सङ्कर्षणी प्रद्युम्नी चानिरुद्धिका॥ ५३॥

वैहायसी च कपिला आत्रेयी कालपौष्करी।
भारद्वाजी च कालाख्या ऐन्द्री बौधायनी तथा॥ ५४॥

स्वर्भानवी जयक्सेना कूर्माख्या शाङ्कुपायिनी।
नारदी कौतुकी ताक्ष्या प्रह्लादी पौष्करी तथा॥ ५५॥

जया हयशिरा चैव तथा कालवपीयका।
पद्मोद्भवा पञ्चकाल्या माया वैभविका तथा॥ ५६॥

49b प्रकृति conj.] प्रभृति ms. 50c पुरुषान्न conj.] पुरुषान्ध्र ms. 51d पाञ्चरात्रं conj.] पञ्चरात्रं ms. 55c ताक्ष्या conj.] तर्ध्या ms.

वासिष्ठा परमा सङ्ख्या और्वा सारस्वती तथा।
सान्दर्शना तथा लक्ष्म्या नरनारायणी तथा॥ ५७॥

हैरण्यगर्भा पौलस्त्या अथासुर्वदा नारदी।
जाज्वलिस्त्वथ शाण्डिल्या कौस्तुभाख्या च संहिता॥ ५८॥

शेषानन्ता सात्वता च बार्हस्पत्याथ गालवा।
सद्याख्या संहिता देवि तथा काश्यपिरेव च॥ ५९॥

सौमन्ता चापि विश्वा च तथा त्रैलोक्यमोहिनी।
चतुश्च यावतारा च नारसैंही त्रिविक्रमा॥ ६०॥

दत्तात्रेयी क्रियासारं सनत्कौमारिका तथा।
लोमहर्षणिका चैव विहगेन्द्रमतं तथा॥ ६१॥

पाराशर्या च कापित्थी तथा सौपर्णकेतुका।
चातुरात्र्या च वायव्या जैगीशव्या च माण्डवी॥ ६२॥

साल्वा कालपरा चैव वैकुण्ठ्यद्युतगौतमा।
नाचिकेता जामदग्नी वैशम्पायनिका तथा॥ ६३॥

श्रीपत्नी चैव शाकल्या ऐश्वरी पार्थिवीतथा।
हौताशनी ध्रुवान्ता च महामान्दारिमानवी॥ ६४॥

नवात्मिकाप्याङ्गिरसी आरुणा शाकटायनी।
अव्यक्ताप्यादिवाराही तथा प्रद्युम्नकामिका॥ ६५॥

ब्रह्मोद्भवा तु किञ्जल्का तेजोस्रवणिका तथा।
कण्ठक्रूरा सत्यभामा मार्काण्डेया भवोद्भवा॥ ६६॥

गुह्यार्णवा स्फोटसिंहं तथा पातालकेसरिम्।
मूर्तिभासा पञ्चमूर्तिनिरुक्ता विश्वसम्भवा॥ ६७॥

61c लोमहर्षणिका conj.] लोहमर्षणिका ms. 61d विहगेन्द्र॰ conj.] विहगेन्द्ध॰ ms. 62d जैगीशव्या] जैगीशिव्या ms. 63c नाचिकेता conj.] लाचिकेता ms.

शतधारा विश्वमुखी विश्वक्सेना अनुष्टुभा।
देशावतारा प्रणवा पद्मगर्भा तु लोमशा॥ ६८॥

सुपर्णा चैव देवेशि शतं वै षोडशाधिकम्।
संहितानां वरारोहे वैष्णवं परिकीर्तितम्॥ ६९॥

प्रत्यक्षादिपरोक्षादिसामान्यमतलक्षणम्।
उद्योगपरिणामं च न पुनर्जन्मलक्षणम्॥ ७०॥

कर्मसम्बन्धिनास्तिक्या भावशून्यमिदं जगत्।
यद्गतं तद्गतं चेति जलबुद्बुदसम्भवम्॥ ७१॥

कः कर्ता को ऽत्र क्रियते मतं मानहतामिति।
जीवादित्येति हृत्स्थं यद्भूताकाशो तमोनुदः॥ ७२॥

तज्ज्योतिष्प्राप्तिलक्षणं सौराणां मतमुत्तमम्।
ज्योतीरूपमिदं सर्वं जगत्स्थावरजङ्गमम्॥ ७३॥

बहुधा गीयते तच्च सौरभेदादिसम्भवम्।
संहितार्थेति निष्पत्तिं तत्प्रवक्ष्यामि साम्प्रतम्॥ ७४॥

मार्ताण्डी संहिता पूर्वं महामार्ताण्डिकी तथा।
तृतीयी भर्गशिखा च तथा भैरवशेखरी॥ ७५॥

वेदमन्त्रादिसङ्गीता जैमिनीया च पञ्चमी।
संहाराख्या तथा षष्ठी भास्करी सप्तमी स्मृता॥ ७६॥

पराख्या चाष्टमी प्रोक्ता नवमी संयमा तथा।
दशमी गुह्यचक्राह्वा महालक्ष्मी तथा परा॥ ७७॥

सहस्रा द्वादशी प्रोक्ता करणा च त्रयोदशी।
चण्डा च व्योमगर्भा च खशोल्का ␣ स्करी॥ ७८॥

वाडवी चैव कारुण्या यमुना च तथाजिता।
तथा सूर्यशिखा नाम रश्मिचक्रा खगेश्वरी ॥ ७९॥

महोल्का च महोल्काख्या नभोल्का व्योममालिनी।
कल्माषा पुष्करावर्ता तथा साम्भाख्यसंहिता॥ ८०॥

वैश्वानरी प्रकाशा च संवर्ताख्या च पिङ्गला।
हनुमाख्या याज्ञवल्की जानकी यज्ञमेखला॥ ८१॥

उच्चैःश्रवाख्याप्यरुणा कालवैश्वानरी प्रभा।
चण्डचेता महादेवा तथा व्याजीवतारिका॥ ८२॥

तारिका तेजति ⊔ याक्षिका मोहतारिका।
जीवार्का परमार्का च प्रशान्तार्का च वैद्युता॥ ८३॥

धर्मध्वजा ज्ञानगर्भा तत्त्वगर्भा ⊔ हा।
हैरण्यगर्भा उत्सुख्या तथान्या हरिमर्दिनी॥ ८४॥

भचक्रा ह्यात्मचेता च तथा पिङ्गलचेतका।
⊔ स्वसाप्यात्रेया रौश्या व्योमा च सारणा॥ ८५॥

रेवन्दाख्या हेतिराजा सहिरा द्रविडा तथा।
और्वा च सारतिपटा मेरुस्पन्दा तथान्त्रिकी॥ ८६॥

महाश्वेता तेजगर्भा महाकैरातिका तथा।
सूर्यधर्मा त्र्योदशात्मा सूर्यधर्मोत्तरा तथा॥ ८७॥

व्योमाङ्गारा व्योमगर्भा पञ्चाशीतिस्तु संहिता।
इत्येताः संहिता देवि मुख्यत्वे सौरभेदतः॥ ८८॥

लक्षावलक्षभेदेन पादकेनावकेन च।
ग्रन्थविस्तारभेदेन कथिताः पारमेश्वरे॥ ८९॥

प्रत्यक्षलक्षनो नाम सौराणां तत्प्रमाणतः।
सम्यगभिहितं यत्र अर्थं बह्वागमाकुलम्॥ ९०॥

अल्पग्रन्थं महार्थं च संहितार्थं च तं विदुः।
तान्त्रिकं यत्समुत्पन्नं स्मृत्वा यत्परिकीर्त्यते॥ ९१॥

87a महाश्वेता conj.] महेश्वेता ms.

सूक्ष्मवादविधानं च पटलं तेन भेदितम्।
आद्यन्तमर्थविस्तारं क्रमाद्वादविनिर्णयम्॥ ९२॥

सर्गपूर्वं तु तं देवि ग्रन्थेभ्यः प्रतिपाद्यते।
पृथग्वस्तुसमूहेन बहुग्रन्थार्थसंकुलम्॥ ९३॥

आनुपूर्व्येण यो वादः स परिच्छेदपूर्वकः।
पृथक्सिद्धस्तु जीवो वै हेयोपादेयलक्षणः॥ ९४॥

मायाणुकार्मिको बन्धश्चिदचिद्बोधपूर्वकः।
भोग्योन्मुखत्ववर्तित्वाद्वैराग्यप्रतिपत्तये॥ ९५॥

जिज्ञासुः परमं तत्त्वं शक्तिपातस्य लक्षणम्।
दानक्षपणहेत्वादिसूक्ष्मदेहविनाशनम्॥ ९६॥

सेश्वरं यत्परं शान्तं पदं प्राप्नोति निश्चितम्।
प्रसादाख्यं तु यन्मन्त्रं सिद्धान्तं समुदाहृतम्॥ ९७॥

नित्योदितस्वरूपाणि भावानि परमार्थतः।
तन्मयः प्राप्तिसंयोगः स शाक्तः परिकीर्तितः॥ ९८॥

कुलं शरीरमित्याहुर्नाशिवं विद्यते क्वचित्।
स्वभावफलनिष्पत्तिर्नान्यत्परतरं पुनः॥ ९९॥

पिण्डादि यच्चतुर्थान्तसंस्थितं तत्कुलं स्मृतम्।
द्वैताद्वैतादिकं सन्तु तच्चतुर्धा व्यवस्थितम्॥ १००॥

गुह्यमन्त्रप्रकाशादि सर्वसंहारलक्षणम्।
कौलार्थमिति तद्देवि सद्यःप्रत्ययकारकम्॥ १०१॥

अधुना दशधा चैव शैवार्थः परिकीर्त्यते।
दशाष्टादशभेदेन रुद्रभेदादिलक्षणम्॥ १०२॥

एतत्सप्तदशविधो भेदः शब्दादिसम्भवः।
मुख्यत्वे कथितो देवि किञ्चिच्छब्दान्तरान्तरः॥ १०३॥

94a आनुपूर्व्येण conj.] आनु†र्व्येण ms. 100a चतुर्था conj.] चतुर्धा ms.
100c द्वैताद्वैता°] द्वैव्याद्वैता° ms.

ईशानः शब्ददेहस्तु सर्वविद्यात्मकः स्मृतः।
यत्किंचिल्लौकिकं ज्ञानं तत्सर्वं ब्रह्मनिर्गतम्॥ १०४॥

वैदिकं तु तदा विष्णोस्तेजसाध्यात्मनिश्चयः।
ईश्वरश्चातिमार्गं तु मन्त्राख्यं तु सदाशिवात्॥ १०५॥

चतुर्वर्गास्तु एवैते व्यापित्वे संव्यवस्थिताः।
अथ देवातिदेवस्य पञ्चमन्त्रमयस्य च॥ १०६॥

पञ्चस्रोतांसि जातानि शास्त्रोत्पत्तिनिमित्ततः।
ऊर्ध्वतः पूर्वतः प्राच्यां याम्य उत्तरतः क्रमात्॥ १०७॥

स्रोतस्यूर्ध्वे भवेज्ज्ञानं शिवरुद्राख्यजं पुरा।
कामिकं योगजं चिन्त्यं माकुटमंशुमान्पुनः॥ १०८॥

दीप्तं सूक्ष्मं तु साहस्रमजितानन्तकं तथा।
शिवभेदाः समाख्याता रुद्रभेदञ्शृणु प्रिये॥ १०९॥

विजयं पारमेशं च निश्श्वाशोद्गीतमेव च।
मुखबिम्बं च सिद्धं च सन्तानं नारसिंहकम्॥ ११०॥

चन्द्राह्वं वीरभद्रं च आग्नेयं च स्वयम्भुवम्।
विसरं रौरवाह्वं च विमलं किरणं तथा॥ १११॥

ललितं सौरभेयं च तन्त्राण्याहुर्महेश्वरि।
अष्टाविंशतिभेदं तु ऊर्ध्वस्रोतोविनिर्गतम्॥ ११२॥

अष्टाविंशति ये तन्त्रा भूर्लोके तु प्रकाशिताः।
शिवाद्याद्दृक्समुत्पन्ना भुक्तिमुक्तिफलप्रदाः॥ ११३॥

108a स्रोतस्यूर्ध्वे (TĀV) conj.] स्रोतोभेदाभवेज् ms. 108b शिवरुद्राख्यजं पुरा] शिवरुद्राभिधं द्विधा (TĀV) 108c कामिकं] कामजं TĀV 108cd योगजं चिन्त्यं माकुटम् conj.] योजकं चित्र्यं नाकुटम् ms. 109d रुद्रभेदञ्शृणु प्रिये] रुद्रभेदंस्त्विमाञ्छृणु TĀV 110a पारमेशं च] चैव निःश्वासं TĀV 110b निश्श्वाशोद्गीतम् एव च conj.] निश्श्वाशोद्गतिमेव च ms., मद्गीतं पारमेश्वरम् TĀV 110d नारसिंहकम् (TĀV) conj.] नारसैंहिकम् ms. 111a चन्द्राह्वं] चन्द्रांशु TĀV 111c रौरवाह्वं च] रौरवाः पञ्च TĀV 112b तन्त्राण्याहुर् conj.] तन्त्रा ह्याहुर् ms. 112c विंशतिभेदं तु] विंशतिरित्येवं TĀV

बहुग्रन्थार्थभेदैश्च तान्प्रवक्ष्यामि साम्प्रतम् ।
अष्टाविंशति ये भेदाः सा तनुः पारमेश्वरी ॥ ११४ ॥

शरीरं देवदेवस्य शब्दब्रह्मप्रतिष्ठितम् ।
अनुग्रहार्थं भूतानां नान्यथा कायसम्भवः ॥ ११५ ॥

मन्त्रमूर्तिः स भगवान्सादाख्यः परमेश्वरः ।
शरीरं रुद्रभेदैस्तु शिवभेदैश्च पार्वति ॥ ११६ ॥

सर्वमन्त्रा ⊔ यत्वे ऽपि यो जानाति स वेदवित् ।
शिरःप्रभृति पादान्तं तत्प्रवक्ष्यामि साम्प्रतम् ॥ ११७ ॥

मूर्ध्नस्तु विजयं ज्ञानं ललाटात्पारमेश्वरम् ।
नेत्रेभ्यश्चैव निःश्वासं ज्ञानराजमनुत्तमम् ॥ ११८ ॥

श्रवणाभ्यां च प्रोद्गीतं मुखाच्च मुखबिम्बकम् ।
स्कन्धयोः सिद्धसंज्ञस्तु संतानं कक्षदेशतः ॥ ११९ ॥

वक्षसो नारसिंहस्तु स्तनाभ्यां चन्द्रसंज्ञकम् ।
हृदयाद्वीरभद्राख्यमाग्नेयं जठरोद्भवम् ॥ १२० ॥

स्वायम्भुवं नाभिदेशात्पार्श्वाभ्यां विसरं तथा ।
रौरवं पृष्ठदेशात्तु विमलं कटिदेशतः ॥ १२१ ॥

लिङ्गात्किरणसंज्ञं तु ललितं चोरुयुग्मतः ।
जानुभ्यां सौरभेयस्तु शिखाग्रात्कामिकं तथा ॥ १२२ ॥

शिखाया योगजं चैव जिह्वायाश्चिन्त्यसंज्ञकम् ।
माकुटं मुकुटाज्जातं बाहुभ्यामंशुमांस्तथा ॥ १२३ ॥

लोचनत्रितयाद्दीप्तं सूक्ष्मं कण्ठाद्विनिर्गतम् ।
दन्तैरेव च साहस्रं हस्तयोरजितं तथा ॥ १२४ ॥

118a विजयं ज्ञानं conj.] (Pārameśvara) विजयात्मानं ms. 118d °राजमनुत्तमम् conj.] (Pārameśvara) °राजानमुत्तमम् ms. 123a शिखाया conj.] शिखायां ms. 123b जिह्वायाश् conj.] जिह्वायां ms.

पादयोरन्तनामाख्यं तन्त्रं तारागणोद्भवम् ।
यो ऽन्यः परतरो भेदः शिवमन्त्रस्य पठ्यते ॥ १२५ ॥

संग्रहः स तु विज्ञेयः ऋषिदेवगणैर्गिरा ।

तद्वद्वामदक्षिणभेदावष्टौ मूर्ध्नोपलक्षितौ व्याख्यास्यामः । तच्चैकादशभेदभिन्नसम्बन्ध-
निमित्तभेदसंज्ञाप्रमाणवक्तृश्रोतृ ··· पूर्वस्वरूपशास्त्रार्थदर्शको वक्तव्यः ।

वाच्यवाचकसम्बन्धसर्वभेदादिलक्षणम् ॥ १२६ ॥

वाच्यो ऽर्थो वाचकः शब्दः स चार्थो बहुधा भवेत् ।
सन्निमित्तं समारम्भं वस्तुपूर्वमहेतुकम् ॥ १२७ ॥

प्रतिपत्त्यादिसामान्यं सतर्कं आनुमेयकम् ।
शब्दास्तु पूर्ववद्देवि तथा च बहुभेदतः ॥ १२८ ॥

बाह्यनैश्चायिका बुद्धिः शुक्तिकारजतभ्रमः ।
सादृश्यत्वात्प्रपत्स्ये ऽद्य ह्यतीतानागतं तथा ॥ १२९ ॥

प्रवर्तते निराकाङ्क्षं बुद्ध्यादि परिहीयते ।
अन्यभावगतत्वाच्च संवेद्येनैव भाव्यते ॥ १३० ॥

ऊहादिलक्षणं देवि स शब्दो बहुभेदतः ।
अनुग्रहार्थं भूतानां निमित्तः परिगीयते ॥ १३१ ॥

संसारविनिवृत्त्यर्थं स्वतन्त्रत्वात्स चेश्वरः ।
स्वभावेनैव जन्तूनामनुग्रहकरः परः ॥ १३२ ॥

मायाबन्धनिमित्तार्थं तद्बन्धान्मोचयेत्पशून् ।
सर्वज्ञत्वादिशास्त्रस्य निमित्तः परिकीर्तितः ॥ १३३ ॥

भेदो बहुविधो देवि बहुत्वाद्ग्रन्थविस्तरात् ।
बुद्धिभेदं तु बौद्धानां शैवानां ईश्वरेति च ॥ १३४ ॥

---

126 prose °वक्तृश्रोतृ conj.] °वक्ता श्रोता ms. 129c ऽद्य conj.] द्यो ms. 134a बहुविधो conj.] बहुविदो ms.

मतभेदं मतार्थानां सौराणां ज्ञानसम्भवम्।
तान्त्रिकाणां रुद्रभेदं वक्तृस्थानामनेकशः॥ १३५॥

शक्तिभेदं क्रियाभेदं मन्त्रभेदं च पठ्यते।
शब्दब्रह्मप्रभूतत्वाद्ब्रह्मचर्यादिभेदतः॥ १३६॥

अवतारप्रभेदाश्च संज्ञाभेदमुदाहृतम्।
षट्प्रमाणाश्च पूर्वोक्ताः प्रत्यक्षाद्याश्च ये स्थिताः॥ १३७॥

स्वसंवेदनमन्यच्च तथा चानुभवः स्मृतः।
प्रमाणश्चाष्टधा देवि शैवे ऽस्मिन्परिगीयते॥ १३८॥

स्रोतोनुसारं वाक्यार्थं सन्देहविनिवृत्तये।
देवताबहुभेदेन अवतारादिभेदतः॥ १३९॥

वक्ता यदभिसम्बन्धः सर्वशास्त्रप्रवर्तकः।
संशयानुदितो भूत्वा संसारविनिवृत्तये॥ १४०॥

किमिदं केन कस्माच्च स्रोतःसम्बन्धलक्षणम्।
आयातादिसमुद्भूतं स्वेच्छया नावतारितम्॥ १४१॥

शिवादनन्तनाथेन ह्यनन्तान्मधुपागतम्।
तन्मुखात्पतितं भूमाववताराष्टकेति च॥ १४२॥

इत्यागमानां सम्बन्धः क्रमायातस्तदागमः।
स्वरूपं कारणत्वेति सच्छास्त्रस्य विनिश्चयः॥ १४३॥

किमर्थमवतीर्णं तु तदर्थं बहुभेदतः।
शिक्षानीत्यादिकं चार्थं योगार्थं आत्मलक्षणम्॥ १४४॥

शैवार्थं ईश्वरप्राप्तिर्ज्ञानार्थं ज्ञेयमुच्यते।
वाक्यार्थं वाक्यनिष्पत्तिर्दीक्षार्थं मोक्षमुच्यते॥ १४५॥

इत्यर्थो बहुधाकारैर्यो ऽर्थश्चार्थाद्विभाव्यते।
अयमर्थ इदं शास्त्रमित्यर्थो बहुभेदतः॥ १४६॥

दर्शकेति यदुद्दिष्टं शास्त्रदृष्ट्यानुमीयते।
अशास्त्रदृष्टं यत्कर्म यच्चर्वादिकलक्षणम्॥ १४७॥

शास्त्रदृष्ट्या कृतं यच्च तदर्थं दर्शको मतः।
इत्येकादशवस्तूनि तत्प्रकारेण वच्महे॥ १४८॥

शम्भुपक्षेण चैकेन शक्तिपक्षेण वा पुनः।
प्राप्यते येन पक्षेण शक्तिपक्षः स उच्यते॥ १४९॥

प्राप्यते यत्परं नित्यं शम्भुपक्षस्तदा भवेत्।
अणुत्वे शब्दनिष्पत्तिर्भूतानां सन्निमित्ततः॥ १५०॥

अवतीर्थानुगृह्णन्ति मन्त्रार्थः शम्भुपक्षगः।
अष्टाविंशतिभेदैस्तु गारुडं हृदयं पुरा॥ १५१॥

सावित्र्युत्तरसंज्ञं तु कलामानं कलामृतम्।
हरहुङ्कार ⊔ बिन्दुं बिन्दुसारं कलोत्तरम्॥ १५२॥

पक्षिराजं शिखायोगं शिखासारं शिखोत्तरम्।
पञ्चभूतं तु भेदाख्यं शिवभेदं च मानसम्॥ १५३॥

नीलकण्ठं च कालाख्यं कालकूटं शतद्रुकम्।
वाकोजं कम्बलं काकं काकतुण्डं कटाहकम्॥ १५४॥

सुवर्णलेधि सुग्रीवं त्रोतुलं त्रोतुलोत्तरः।
इत्यष्टाविंशतिभेदा मया प्रोक्ताः समासतः॥ १५५॥

⊔ पनिर्नाशनार्थं तु भूतानामनुकम्पया।
कुलनागादिरक्षार्थं बहुमन्त्रार्थसंकुलम्॥ १५६॥

चतुर्विंशतिभेदैस्तु हरहुंकारसंज्ञितम्।
प्रथमं पक्षिराजाख्यं पञ्चभेदगतं भवेत्॥ १५७॥

हयग्रीवं कुमारं च ⊔ गोर्मादङ्क्अमेव च।
वज्रतुण्डं शुभाण्डं च पञ्चभेदाः प्रकीर्तिताः॥ १५८॥

150c शब्दनि पत्तिर् conj.] मन्दनि पत्तिर् ms. 154d कटाहकम् conj.] क· ·हकम् ms. 155c इत्यष्टा° conj.] इत्याष्टा° ms.

सप्तधा तच्छिखायोगमानुपूर्व्येण कथ्यते।
शिखाशैव शिखा चैव या च सारं महाभटम्॥ १५९ ॥

कर्णराजं सौरभेदं सप्तमं ⊔ ह्यमालिनम्।
शिखासारं त्रिधा देवि चण्डसारादिलक्षणम्॥ १६० ॥

तुण्डिग्रीवं महाकालं ततो वज्रशिखोत्तरम्।
पातालं तालचण्डं च अट्टहासविषोल्बणम्॥ १६१ ॥

अगधं घोरतुण्डं च विषधरमतं तथा।
होलाख्यं वेगषण्डं च ⊔ निवर्तकम्॥ १६२ ॥

गोनासं भिण्डिचण्डं च शाकलं जीवरक्षणम्।
दशपञ्च च भेदं च कथितं ते शिखोत्तरम्॥ १६३ ॥

नीलदण्डं शिवाख्यं च तालोघुष्टं विलम्बिकम्।
भैरववाख्यं शिवाण्डं च राजमूलं महाबलम्॥ १६४ ॥

कर्णामोटपरादं च इन्द्रवज्रं महागदम्।
इति द्वादशभेदास्तु पञ्चाशतसमुद्भवाः॥ १६५ ॥

सावित्र्योतुलसंज्ञास्तु सर्वे चैकमताः स्मृताः।
भेदाः ख्याता मया ह्येते शिष्या ⊔ स्वरूपतः॥ १६६ ॥

पश्चिमे भूततन्त्राख्यं शिवभेदगतं भवेत्।
तत्र होलाहयग्रीवं करङ्कं कटकामयम्॥ १६७ ॥

करोटी मुण्डमालाख्यं कार्कोटं खड्गरावणम्।
चण्डं चण्डासिधाराख्यं विकटं कटिमण्डलम्॥ १६८ ॥

भूत्रासं च शिखारावं घर्घरं सिंहकोटरम्।
घोराट्टहासमुद्दिष्टं यमघण्टं घटोत्कचम्॥ १६९ ॥

एते दुष्टनिवृत्त्यर्थं भूतानामनुकम्पया।
सर्वव्याधिविनाशार्थं पुरुषाद्धिं ह भेद ⊔॥ १७० ॥

167a पश्चिमे भूततन्त्राख्यं] पश्चिमे भूततन्त्राणि TĀV

निःसृतं रौद्रमन्त्रोर्थं मालामन्त्रैस्तु संकुलम्।
चिकित्साद्यौषधोपेतं दुष्टग्रहविदारणम्॥ १७१॥

अपमृत्युशतैः पूर्णं येन ज्ञातेन नश्यति।
हेलाख्यं प्रथमं यत्तु ह्यायुर्वेदादिलक्षणम्॥ १७२॥

द्वितीयं बालरक्षार्थं हयग्रीवेति विश्रुतम्।
कटङ्कं रूपिकानां च नाशनार्थमुदाहृतम्॥ १७३॥

रतिकामनिवृत्त्यर्थं चतुर्थं कटकाह्वयम्।
नेत्रामयविनाशार्थं शल्यकर्मप्रवर्तकम्॥ १७४॥

नीतिशास्त्रादिसंयुक्तं करोटी पञ्चमं स्मृतम्।
रसवादादिसिद्ध्यर्थं धातुवादादिलक्षणम्॥ १७५॥

तदर्थं मुण्डमालाख्यं षष्ठं तन्त्रं प्रदर्शितम्।
खन्यवादादिकं सर्वं निध ⊔ नाकृष्टिलक्षणम्॥ १७६॥

सर्पाकर्षणयुक्तं च कर्कोटं सप्तमं स्मृतम्।
ग्रहज्वरविषादीनां मालामन्त्रैः समाकुलम्॥ १७७॥

सर्वव्याधिप्रशमनमष्टमं खड्गरावणम्।
चण्डं रक्षपिशाचानां नाशाय नवमं स्मृतम्॥ १७८॥

चण्डासिधारं दशमं सार्धलक्षत्रयं मतम्।
समस्तौषधप्राप्त्यर्थं दमनामाप्रतिष्ठितः॥ १७९॥

लक्षणमोषधीनां तु पृथक्कल्पादिभेदतः।
मन्त्रराजसमूहेन विकटैकादशमं स्मृतम्॥ १८०॥

परसैन्यविनाशार्थं चटकादिप्रसाधनम्।
भूतानां बलिभेदाच्च अमरण्ढकमण्डलम्॥ १८१॥

द्वादशं च महादेवि येन ज्ञातेन मन्त्रभाक्।
सर्वे भूता विनश्यन्ति योगिनी शाकिनी तथा॥ १८२॥

176d निध] followed by insertion mark, but no insertion.

यथार्थनासमुद्दिष्टं भूतत्रासं त्रयोदशम् ।
रावोक्तश्चाष्टधा यत्र भूतानां भयवर्धनः ॥ १८३ ॥

मुद्राभेदानि सर्वाणि योगिनीनां च लक्षणम् ।
तथा हुम्सादिभेदं च नच्छिखानावकीर्तितम् ॥ १८४ ॥

तन्त्रं चतुर्दशं देवि गुह्यमन्त्रार्थसंकुलम् ।
एकभेदं तु भूतानां तथा व्यात्यादिलक्षणम् ॥ १८५ ॥

ज्वरावतरणं यच्च तन्निवारणमेव च ।
भूतयोनिषु सर्वासु तदंशानि विभागशः ॥ १८६ ॥

ज्ञायन्ते येन तन्त्रेण घर्घरं तन्त्रिपञ्चमम् ।
नवलक्षप्रविस्तीर्णं बहुभेदैस्तु सङ्कुलम् ॥ १८७ ॥

मन्त्रवादं तु यन्मुख्यं तदुक्तं सिंहकोटरम् ।
घोराट्टहासं देवेशि लूतापिटकनाशनम् ॥ १८८ ॥

भूमिका ज्ञानसंयुक्तमृद्ध्यष्टकसमन्वितम् ।
यत्र प्रयोगसामान्यदृष्टनष्टादिलक्षणम् ॥ १८९ ॥

इन्द्रजालादिसंकीर्णं षोडशं परिकीर्तितम् ।
देवतानां प्रमाणं च यजनमृद्धिकर्मणि ॥ १९० ॥

नक्तयागं गुह्यसूत्रं वाच्योच्चाटनलक्षणम् ।
क्षुद्रकर्मादिकं यत्तु रौद्रमन्त्रपरिवृतम् ॥ १९१ ॥

उच्छिष्टं नाम तज्ज्ञेयं तन्त्रं सप्तदशं स्मृतम् ।
धारणाज्ज्ञानभेदं तु स्तुत्यादिसमलङ्कृतम् ॥ १९२ ॥

स्थिरत्वं देहपिण्डाद्यजराव्याधिविनाशनम् ।
परचिकीर्षज्ञत्वं च परकाशप्रवेशनम् ॥ १९३ ॥

ओषधीनां तु संयोगं स्थितत्वं रुद्ररेतसः ।
वर्णितं यत्र देवेन सर्वभूतहितेशिना ॥ १९४ ॥

191d मन्त्र] [कर्म (deleted)] मन्त्र ms.

उच्छिष्टं तं वरारोहे तन्त्रमष्टादशं स्मृतम्।
क्रीडकर्माणि भूतानां स्वस्थावेशादिलक्षणम्॥ १९५॥

प्रमाणं भूत ⊔ निःशेषं यत्र वर्णितम्।
ग्रन्थभेदेन सर्वत्र क्रियाभेदेन निश्चितम्॥ १९६॥

उदयं चैव मन्त्राणां संहारमन्त्रवर्णितम्।
अथ प्रमाणं निःशेषं लोकपालादिलक्षणम्॥ १९७॥

पृथ्वी ससागरवना यत्रोक्ता परमेश्वरे।
वैनतेयेन यत्पृष्टं यत्पृष्टं भृगुसूनुना॥ १९८॥

तत्सर्वं यत्र चोद्दिष्टं यमघण्टं तु तं विदुः।
एकोनविंशतितमं सार्वकोटीप्रविस्तरम्॥ १९९॥

अपरं विषमं देवि सर्वमन्त्रालयं शुभम्।
रावणादवतीर्णं यत् ⊔ द्वटोत्कचम्॥ २००॥

पातालखण्डं प्रथमं हाटकेश्वरसंज्ञकम्।
दशधा तत्समाख्यातं तत्प्रवक्ष्यामि सारतः॥ २०१॥

हाटकेशं घटाख्यं च तथा विषमसंभवम्।
सर्वसंहारकं चान्यं तत्पातालशिखोत्तरम्॥ २०२॥

कुसुमालिमतं चैव सप्तमं कामपञ्जरम्।
गुह्यार्णवं पिचुमतं दशसामनिका स्मृता॥ २०३॥

द्विधावतारखण्डं च तद्ब्रवीमि यथार्थतः।
कुलार्णवं तु प्रथमं तथा क्रमचतुष्टयम्॥ २०४॥

कुलार्णवं तु दशधा यथावत्कथयामि ते।
कुलं महाकुलं चैव महाकालिकुलं तथा॥ २०५॥

विद्याकुलं कामिकुले कुलं चूडामणिं तथा।
कुलं भैरवसामान्यं तथा मातृकुलं शुभम्॥ २०६॥

विद्याकुलं शक्तिकुलं कुला ⊔ :प्रकीर्तिताः।
क्रमभेदं यथा देवि तत्समासेन मे शृणु॥ २०७॥

सृष्टिक्रमं कालिक्रमं संहारक्रमसंयुतम्।
अवतारक्रमं चान्यदित्थं क्रमचतुष्टयम्॥ २०८॥

सृष्टिक्रमं चतुर्धा तु भेदैर्भवति पार्वति।
रागावतारं प्रथमं लक्षार्धं कथितं मया॥ २०९॥

कुलावतारं द्वितीयं मन्त्रावतरणं तथा।
ते वर्णि[ता]वताराख्यं चतुर्धा सृष्टिरुच्यते॥ २१०॥

कालिक्रमं चतुर्धा वै यथाभेदमुदाहृतम्।
कालिक्रमं तु प्रथमं महाकालिक्रमं तथा॥ २११॥

कालसंकर्षणिक्रमं तथा पीठक्रमं स्मृतम्।
संहारं च तथा वक्ष्ये यथावत्परमेश्वरि॥ २१२॥

संहारक्रमपूर्वं वै भैरवीशक्तिसंयुतम्।
कालाख्यं द्वितीयं नाम भावसंहारकारकम्॥ २१३॥

सर्वसंहारसंज्ञं च चतुर्थं परिकीर्तितम्।
क्रमसृष्टिः कुलसृष्टिर्भावसृष्टिस्तृतीयका॥ २१४॥

⊔ सृष्टिर्गुरुसृष्टिरिति सृष्टिक्रमं विदुः।
अयोध्याखण्डसंज्ञं यत्तृतीयं खण्डमुच्यते॥ २१५॥

अष्टधा तत्समाख्यातं तच्छृणुष्व महातपे।
भल्लविज्जारदष्टिश्च विन्ध्यखण्डस्तृतीयकः॥ २१६॥

चन्द्रिका खण्डसामान्यं तथा तारागणोद्भवम्।
जयद्रथाख्यमन्यच्च भिन्नतारकमेव च॥ २१७॥

नाम्ना वै सर्ववीरं च ह्येतत्खण्डत्रयं विदुः।
एतद्घटोत्कचं तन्त्रं कोटिभेदैरनेकशः॥ २१८॥

गुह्याद्गुह्यतरं चैव मन्त्रैस्संवृतमुत्तमम् ।
एतत्तु पश्चिमं वक्त्रं समासात्कथितं मया ॥ २१९ ॥

दक्षिणे दक्षिणं मार्गं चतुर्विंशतिभेदतः ।
तेषां मध्ये महाघोरं घोरघोरं दिशां मुखम् ॥ २२० ॥

भीमखण्डपराख्यं च महावेतालसंज्ञकम् ।
असिताङ्गं महोच्छुष्मं क्रोधमुन्मत्तभैरवम् ॥ २२१ ॥

चण्डाख्यं कमलाख्यं च महाभैरवशेखरम् ।
सिद्धयोगीश्वरीतन्त्रं योगिनीजालसम्भवम् ॥ २२२ ॥

पञ्चामृतं प्रपञ्चाख्यं बिम्बभैरवकण्ठकम् ।
भैरवामृतमुत्कोचं तिलकं यामलं तथा ॥ २२३ ॥

एते भेदा महादेवि यथावत्कथयामि ते ।
प्रथमं घोरघोणं तु तच्चतुर्धा प्रकीर्तितम् ॥ २२४ ॥

विद्युद्घोणं च वेतालं मलिचण्डं तृतीयकम् ।
सुरासवं चतुर्थं तु गुह्यभूतं महातपे ॥ २२५ ॥

महावेतालकं यं तु तद्द्विधा परिकीर्तितम् ।
शुष्कालोरिं तु प्रथमं रुष्टसर्वस्वमेव च ॥ २२६ ॥

महाघोरे प्रवक्ष्यामि दक्षिणस्रोतसोद्भवम् ।
बहुकोटिप्रविस्तीर्णं चतुर्विंशतिभेदतः ॥ २२७ ॥

महाघोरं तु प्रथमं तथा चानन्दभैरवम् ।
लाकुलं चान्धि श्रीपूर्वं तथा विज्ञानभैरवम् ॥ २२८ ॥

अघोरीश्वरीस्वच्छन्दं विद्यास्वच्छन्दमेव च ।
सारं स्वच्छन्दसंज्ञं च रसस्वच्छन्दकं तथा ॥ २२९ ॥

राजपुत्रीयकं चैव यः स्वच्छन्दः स्वतन्त्रकः ।
चेटिकातालकं नाम गुह्यसारं तथा शुभम् ॥ २३० ॥

220a दक्षिणे दक्षिणं मार्गं] दक्षिणे दक्षिणो मर्गश् TĀV

बिन्दुस्वच्छन्दकं नाम नादस्वच्छन्दमेव च।
रौरवं कालदण्डं च ह्यूलकाद्यं तथैव च॥ २३१॥

क्रमोज्झितं च साटोपं चन्द्रगर्भं सुरार्चितम्।
मृत्युनाम चतुर्विंशं महाघोरमुदाहृतम्॥ २३२॥

घोरघोणं प्रवक्ष्यामि ह्यष्टमं यत्प्रकीर्तितम्।
प्रथमं घोरघोणं च नवकोटिप्रविस्तरम्॥ २३३॥

अष्टाशीतिसहस्राणि भैरवोत्तरनायिका।
चन्द्रिकाख्या भगवतीभेदैर्गीता तु पार्वति॥ २३४॥

लम्बोदरी नित्यतृप्ता ह्युदयास्तमवर्जिता।
मन्त्रभेदेन कथिता भक्तानां हितकाम्यया॥ २३५॥

अतः परं मृत्युजिह्वं ततः शुष्काकुलं परम्।
वह्निपादं भीमशिवं हेरुनोर्मिकुलं तथा॥ २३६॥

चित्तवादं कामदण्डमित्यष्टौ कीर्तिता मया।
दिशां मुखं चाष्टविधमधुना मतभेदतः॥ २३७॥

महावेतालसंज्ञं च नवमं कौलमेव च।
अधुना सांप्रतं देवि ह्यसिताङ्गं प्रकीर्त्यते॥ २३८॥

चतुर्धा प्रथितं तच्च कालपक्षेति विश्रुतम्।
ब्रह्मवाद्यं दुराख्यं च कल्मषण्डेति गीयते॥ २३९॥

महोच्छुष्मं ततो देवि दशधा परिपठ्यते।
शिखोच्छुष्मं तथा कौली वीरभेदमतः परम्॥ २४०॥

अष्टवीरेश्वरं चान्यमृद्धिकामं महाद्भुतम्।
शुद्धशिक्षामतं चापि तथा सारस्वतं मतम्॥ २४१॥

कालजिह्वं कुवीराख्यं सिद्धसन्तानकं तथा।
अतः परं प्रवक्ष्यामि क्रोधमुन्मत्तभैरवम्॥ २४२॥

भेदद्वयेन चाख्यातं सरहस्यं तु पार्वति।
अनामकं तु प्रथमं चन्द्रचूडामणिं तथा॥ २४३॥

जयाख्यं सप्तधा भद्रे वैजयं प्रथमं ततः।
वारुणं भद्रचूडं च सारामृतमहोत्कटम्॥ २४४॥

परावर्तं काक्षमि ⊔ ।
⊔ किमन्यच्च विद्यातिलकमेव च॥ २४५॥

तिलकं भैरवाख्यं च यामलं परिपठ्यते।
अष्टधा यामलं देवि सूत्रान्ते कथयामि ते॥ २४६॥

रुद्रभेदं ब्रह्मभेदं विष्णुभेदं तथैव च।
यामलान्तर्गतं देवि इत्येतद्दक्षिणं मुखम्॥ २४७॥

उदक्स्रोतसि वामाख्यं चतुर्विंशतिभेदतः।
तेषां मध्ये महातन्त्रं नयसूत्रं नयोत्तरम्॥ २४८॥

महासंमोहनं चान्यद्वीणातन्त्रं शिखोत्तरम्।
अजितं विजयं त्वन्यच्चिन्तामणिमहोदयम्॥ २४९॥

विद्याभ्युदयनान्तं च चतुर्वामामृताङ्कतम्।
⊔ कं तथा॥ २५०॥

कालाङ्कतं तु प्रथितं षष्ठं गुह्याङ्कतं स्मृतम्।
षड्विधाङ्कतमेतत्तु सर्वपूजितकं तथा॥ २५१॥

लक्षार्धं ⊔ संज्ञं तु कथितं सारमुत्तमम्।
पञ्चवक्त्रा स्मृता यत्र भगिन्यो भ्रातृभिस्सह॥ २५२॥
महागुह्यमिदं देवि न ⊔ च्यमनामकम्।
अतः परं कामधेनुं चतुर्धा परिपठ्यते॥ २५३॥

वामगुह्यं तु प्रथमं शान्तिकं मानसं तथा।
अजतुण्डं चतुर्थं तु ततो वक्ष्ये करम्बकम्॥ २५४॥

246a च conj.] द ms. 252b उत्तमम् conj.] उत्तम् ms.

सप्तधा भेदभिन्नं तत्प्रथमं च करम्बकम्।
समुद्रोर्मिद्वितीयं तु स्तम्भाद्यं मोहनं तथा॥ २५५॥

सिंहराजं वाजिमुखं नौर्बन्धं सप्तमं स्मृतम्।
अनन्तं तु ततो वक्ष्ये पञ्चधा गणव ⊔ ते॥ २५६॥

अनामकं भिन्नशीर्षमेकवीरं बलोत्कटम्।
अप्सराजं तथा देवि शौक्रं शुक्राद्विनिःसृतम्॥ २५७॥

वामदेवेन कथितं भार्गवस्य हितैषिणा।
चक्रे द्वादशसाहस्री शौक्राख्या संहिता शुभा॥ २५८॥

महामन्त्रगणाकीर्णा सरहस्या तु पार्वति।
यस्या अष्टावृतं भूतं देवैरात्मसमैः शुभैः॥ २५९॥

वामाचाररतैर्देवि ब्रह्माद्यैः कोटिसंख्यया।
चतुष्कं तु ततो वक्ष्ये तच्चतुर्धा प्रकीर्तितम्॥ २६०॥

जयाचतुष्कं प्रथमं विजयाख्यं तथैव च।
जयन्त्याख्यं तृतीयं तु तथा चैवापराजितम्॥ २६१॥

चतुष्कं प्रतिभेदश्च नवधा यत्र कीर्त्यते।
महामन्त्रालयं गूढं ततो वै बीजपञ्जरम्॥ २६२॥

तच्चतुर्धा समाख्यातं पञ्जरं शक्तिपञ्जरम्।
बीजपञ्जरकं देवि तथा सारस्वतं मतम्॥ २६३॥

आनन्दाख्यं संहितार्थं लक्षग्रन्थार्थविस्तरम्।
सर्वमन्त्रादिसंयुक्तं भवरुद्राख्यजं महत्॥ २६४॥

शर्वाख्यं चन्द्रशकलं सोमराजं कलामुखम्।
तथा सिद्धमतं देवि पञ्चधा परिपठ्यते॥ २६५॥

किङ्करेशं ततो वक्ष्ये येन ज्ञातेन सिद्ध्यति।
क्षीरोदकमतं नित्यं हाटकेशं विराजितम्॥ २६६॥

दूतीमुखं तत्त्वभेदं मूलवाक्यं मनोन्मनम् ।
एतत्सप्तविधं देवि तथा वक्ष्ये पराङ्मुखम् ॥ २६७ ॥

सिद्धकौलं नागसंज्ञं तथा विद्याष्टकं शुभम् ।
कामेश्वरं सिद्धराजं पञ्चधा परिकीर्तितम् ॥ २६८ ॥

चतुर्विंशतिभेदैस्तु मुख्यैर्वाममुखोद्गतैः ।
रहस्यैर्गूढमन्त्रैश्च सर्वकामार्थसाधकैः ॥ २६९ ॥

ग्रन्थकोटिप्रविस्तीर्णं वामवक्त्रमुदाहृतम् ।
अन्यत्संक्षेपतो वक्ष्ये गीतं यत्परमेष्ठिना ॥ २७० ॥

तेषां भेदं प्रवक्ष्यामि चतुष्षष्टिविभागशः ।
भैरवं यामलं देवि मताख्यं पिङ्गलं तथा ॥ २७१ ॥

चक्राष्टकं शिखाष्टं च बहुरूपं च सप्तमम् ।
वागीश्याचाष्टसंप्रोक्तमष्टमं वीरवन्दिते ॥ २७२ ॥

एतत्सादाशिवं तन्त्रं कथयामि समासतः ।
स्वच्छन्दभैरवश्चण्डः क्रोध उन्मत्तभैरवः ॥ २७३ ॥

असिताङ्गं महोच्छुष्मं कापालीशाष्टमं मतम् ।
ब्रह्मयामलमित्युक्तं वेतालं चाष्टमं स्मृतम् ॥ २७४ ॥

विष्णुयामलकं तथा स्कन्दमुमा रुरुश्चैव ।
सप्तमं रुद्रमित्युक्तं वेतालं चाष्टमं स्मृतम् ॥ २७५ ॥

चण्डभेदाः स्मृता ह्येते भैरवे वीरवत्सले ।
भैरवी प्रथमा प्रोक्ता पिचुतन्त्रसमुद्भवा ॥ २७६ ॥

सा द्विधा भेदतः ख्याता तृतीयं च तथोच्यते ।
ब्राह्मी कलाचतुर्थी च विजयाख्या तु पञ्चमी ॥ २७७ ॥

चन्द्राख्या चैव षष्ठी स्यान्मङ्गला सर्वमङ्गला ।
एते ते मङ्गला भेदाः क्रोधेशेन तु भाषिताः ॥ २७८ ॥

---

270 –285 some of the verses are quoted in TĀV 1.18.

प्रथमं मन्त्रचक्रं तु वर्णचक्रं द्वितीयकम्।
तृतीयं शक्तिचक्रं तु कलाचक्रं चतुर्थकम्॥ २७९॥

पञ्चमं बिन्दुचक्रं तु षष्टं वै नादसंज्ञितम्।
सप्तमं गुह्यचक्रं तु खचक्रं चाष्टमं मतम्॥ २८०॥

एते वै चक्रभेदास्तु असिताङ्गेन भाषिताः।
अन्धकं रुरुभेदं च ह्यजाख्यं मूलसंज्ञकम्॥ २८१॥

कलामोटं विडङ्गं च ज्वालिन्या मातृरोदनम्।
एते स्वच्छन्दभेदाश्च बहुरूपेण भाषिताः॥ २८२॥

भैरवी तु शिखा प्रोक्ता वीणा चैव द्वितीयका।
वीणामणिस्तृतीयं तु संमोहं तु चतुर्थकम्॥ २८३॥

पञ्चमं डामरं नाम षष्ठं चैवास्यथर्वकम्।
कबन्धं सप्तमं ख्यातं शिरश्छेदमथाष्टकम्॥ २८४॥

एते देवि शिखाभेदा उन्मत्तेन तु भाषिताः।
एतत्सादाशिवं चक्रमष्टाष्टकविभेदतः॥ २८५॥

स्रोतोद्भवमिदं पुण्यमनन्तं तद्विभूषितम्।
अनन्तभास्करेणेदं अनन्तेशेण भाषितम्॥ २८६॥

शक्तित्रितयसंभिन्नं मुद्रारत्नविसर्पितम्।
अनेकाकारसंभिन्नं महामण्डलनायकम्॥ २८७॥

विविद्यासहस्रसङ्कीर्णं दिव्यवक्राम्बुजोद्भवम्।
विंशत्कोटिनिबद्धास्तु हृदि तन्त्राः प्रकीर्तिताः॥ २८८॥

नवकोटिप्रविस्तीर्णं सिद्धयोगेश्वरीमतम्।
सार्धकोटित्रयोक्तानि तन्त्राण्यन्यानि भैरवि॥ २८९॥

लक्षार्धलक्षभेदेन पञ्चाद्भूता वरानने।
सहस्रत्रयसंख्यातास्तथा पञ्चाशतानि च॥ २९०॥

285c चक्रम्] चक्रं म् ms.

शतार्धं शतिका चैव अत्रे ततो ऽथ भामिनि।
केचित्सादाशिवे तत्त्वे अन्ये चानन्तसंज्ञिके॥ २९१॥

अन्ये गुप्तास्तु रुद्रस्य विद्याख्ये चापरे तथा।
प्राकृते तु महातत्त्वे गुरुपङ्क्तित्रये तथा॥ २९२॥

गुरुणाधिकगुरुणा बुद्धावहङ्कारे तथैव च।
ततः श्रीकण्ठनाथेन विस्मृतं सृष्टिसागरे॥ २९३॥

शिवः शिखा तथा ज्योतिर्विमलश्च चतुर्थकः।
एभ्यः सकाशादाख्यातं ततो ऽमर्त्यमुपागतम्॥ २९४॥

मुद्रामण्डलपीठं तु पञ्चपीठं तथैव च।
विद्यापीठं तथा प्रोक्तं चतुष्पीठा तु संहिता॥ २९५॥

श्रीकण्ठसौमकौमारं मौसलिजाजलिं तथा।
विमलं चाष्टहासं च घोरस्वच्छन्दमष्टमम्॥ २९६॥

दुर्वासमेचकं चैव तथा सारस्वतं परम्।
जयद्रथं च फेङ्कारं पञ्चमं परिकीर्तितम्॥ २९७॥

रक्ताख्यं लम्पटाख्यं च सप्तधा ब्रह्मयामलम्।
हंसयक्षिणिमातङ्गमेकवीराम्बुपौष्करम्॥ २९८॥

वामदेवेन सहितं सप्तधा पारमेश्वरम्।
हंसपारमेश्वरं यत्तद्द्विधा परिपठ्यते॥ २९९॥

पाटयक्षिणिहंसाख्यं लक्षैर्नवतिविस्तरम्।
यक्षिणी परमेशं च नवधा परिपठ्यते॥ ३००॥

किरणाख्यं नन्दिमतं हंसिनी ब्रह्ममण्डलम्।
स्वायंभुवं स्कन्दमतं प्रतिष्ठापारमेश्वरम्॥ ३०१॥

लिङ्गकल्पं सगार्गीयं नवकोटिप्रविस्तरम्।
मातङ्गाख्यं च यत्तन्त्रं त्रिधा तत्परिपठ्यते॥ ३०२॥

कल्पशाखा तु मातङ्गमृगेन्द्राख्या च संहिता।
एकवीरं द्विधा भद्रे सार्धलक्षत्रयं विदुः॥ ३०३॥

पैतामहमेकवीरमम्बाख्यं पञ्चधा ततः।
अम्बासंज्ञं गुह्यसूत्रं तथान्यत्पिङ्गलामतम्॥ ३०४॥

प्रतिष्ठाषद्कदीक्षार्णमित्येतत्पञ्चधा स्थितम्।
पौष्करं देवि यत्तन्त्रं सप्तधा परिपठ्यते॥ ३०५॥

पुष्करं ब्रह्मवल्ली च तथा नारायणीयकम्।
कुबेरषद्कं कालिञ्जं तथा हालाहलं मतम्॥ ३०६॥

योगिनीमतमन्यच्च वामदेवमथोच्यते।
वामदेवं चतुष्काख्यं तथा तुम्बुरुपञ्जरम्॥ ३०७॥

सर्वज्ञमेत†अन्यच्च गुह्यषद्कं गणाम्बिके।
तत्त्वशाखा देववल्ली सर्वमन्त्रार्णवं परम्॥ ३०८॥

अष्टधा कथितं देवि सप्तकोटिप्रविस्तरम्।
नीलाम्बरं सुतारं च सन्ध्यायोगिनि डामरम्॥ ३०९॥

स्वायंभुवं सिद्धमतं गणाख्यं खेचरीमतम्।
अष्टौ कौलास्त्वमी ख्याताः सद्यःप्रत्ययकारकाः॥ ३१०॥

नवमं तु महाकौलं यत्सुरैरपि दुर्लभम्।
मौलं समुद्भवं पीठं कौलाख्यं तन्त्रमेव च॥ ३११॥

मूलपीठं चतुर्धा तु योगिभिः परिपठ्यते।
योगपीठोपपीठं च गुह्यपीठं समार्तिकम्॥ ३१२॥

मत्तपीठं च दशधा यथावत्कथयामि ते।
मत्तपीठं तु सिद्धाख्यं जाल □ मथोत्तरम्॥ ३१३॥

श्रीपीठमिष्टमर्धं च सर्त्तिपीठं सशम्भुकम्।
नादपीठं बिन्दुपीठं चक्रपीठं महेश्वरि॥ ३१४॥

सम्यग्धं वामदक्षे तु पञ्चधा परिकीर्तितम्।
षट्स्रोतसमिदं शैवं पञ्चस्रोतोद्भवात्परम्॥ ३१५॥

शिखा कमेश्वरं पूर्वं मीनाख्यं किरणं परम्।
धात्रीमतं ह⁞लोरि वासुकिं पञ्चमं स्मृतम्॥ ३१६॥

अधस्स्रोतोद्भवा एते भेदाः पातालसंज्ञकाः।
तन्त्रं संहितसूत्रं च संग्रहं शास्त्रमेवच॥ ३१७॥

कल्पाच्छन्धं तथा कल्पमागमं सप्तधा विदुः।
चक्रस्थं परिवारोक्तं चतुर्थं पञ्चकं तथा॥ ३१८॥

षड्योनिमतार्थं च देवता बहुलं तु यत्।
याज्ययाजकसंयत्कृस्तान्तस्तेनेह ⊔ कीर्तितः॥ ३१९॥

संहितार्थं तु पूर्वोक्तं संख्यंत्यर्थविनिश्चयाम्।
सारात्सारतरं यत्तु संहितार्थं तदुच्यते॥ ३२०॥

गूढार्थमल्पग्रन्थं यद्वक्ष्यमाणमनेकधा।
तत्सूत्रार्थं समुद्दिष्टमाद्यन्तान्तविनिश्चितम्॥ ३२१॥

संग्रहार्थं च विस्तारं कालान्तरनिमित्ततः।
स्वल्पार्थमल्पग्रन्थं च संग्रहं तेन कीर्तितम्॥ ३२२॥

अनुशासयिता यत्र अनुशास्यादिलक्षणम्।
शास्त्रप्रामाण्यनिर्दिष्टं शासनाच्छास्त्रमुच्यते॥ ३२३॥

एका शक्तिः शिवश्चैको बहुभेदोपचर्यते।
भेदं तु कल्पनामात्रमेकदेशादिलक्षणम्॥ ३२४॥

स्वल्पप्रज्ञाप्रमेयन्धात्कल्पस्तेनेह कल्पितः।
कल्पानां यत्समूहं तदवतार्यावतारकम्॥ ३२५॥

नैश्चायिकमिदं तत्स्थं कल्पं स्कन्धं तदुच्यते।
इति ह्यागमसंबन्धं सप्तधा परिकीर्तितम्॥ ३२६॥

315c षट्स्रोतसम्] षट्स्रोतेसम् ms.

एवमुक्तानि भेदानि सरहस्यानि यानि तु।
तानि स्युः शिवभेदानि षट्स्रोताः कथितानि तु॥ ३२७॥

शब्दार्णवप्रमाणानि मन्त्रतन्त्राणि यानि तु।
ज्ञानार्णवसमुत्तानि मोक्षार्थफलदानि तु॥ ३२८॥

इत्थं शिवेन श्रीकण्ठ्यं स्रोतोभेदः प्रदर्शितः।

Appendix 2
Verse Index

Appendix 3
Bibliography

Only very few abbreviations are used in this thesis, because it was thought that the waste of paper produced by repeating the names of texts was insignificant in comparison with the time necessary to memorize idiosyncracies. The texts that are mentioned on almost every page are of course abbreviated: TĀ (*Tantrāloka*), TĀV (*Tantrālokaviveka*), ĪPK/ĪPV/ĪPVV (*Īśvarapratyabhijñā-kārikā, -vimarśinī, -vivṛtivimarśinī*), PTV (*Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*). *Mālinī* or *Mālinītantra* is often used instead of the full name *Mālinīvijayottaratantra*. MW stands for MONIER-WILLIAMS', and pw/PW for the shorter and longer dictionaries of BÖHTLINGK.

Where possible the texts were quoted according to verse numbering. Especially in the case of the *Tantrālokaviveka* this seemed advisable, because the reprint of the main edition has been repaginated. One exception is TĀV on 1.18, where I have, because of the length of the passage, also given the page numbers according to the reprint. The PTV has been quoted according to the page numbers of the KSTS edition, because this pagination is reproduced in GNOLI's new critical edition and has the advantage of being a smaller unit. References to the *Bṛhadvimarśinī* are given according to volume and page. The resolution of Sandhi in the KSTS has not been changed.

References to the *Mālinīvijayavārttika* are indicated by italic numbers and refer by default to the first Kāṇḍa.

Sanskrit Texts

If more than one edition is given, the reference is always to the one mentioned first.

Ajaḍapramātṛsiddhi → *Siddhitrayī*
Artharatnāvalī → *Nityaṣoḍaśikārṇava*

Aṣṭaprakaraṇa Aṣṭaprakaraṇam, ed. Vrajavallabha Dvivedī, Varanasi 1988 (Yogatantra-Granthamālā 12)

Āgamaḍambara Āgamaḍambara Otherwise called Ṣaṇmatanāṭaka of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa. Ed. by V. Raghavan & Anantalal Thakur, Darbhanga: Mithila Institute 1964 (Mithila Institute Series, Ancient text 7)

Āgamaprāmāṇya Āgamaprāmāṇya of Yāmunācārya. Ed. M. Narasimhachary, Baroda: Oriental Institute 1976 (Gaekwad's Oriental Series 160)

Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati [also: *Tantrapaddhati*, *Siddhāntasāra*], ed. Gaṇapati Sāstri, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 69, 72, 77 & 83, Trivandrum 1920–25

Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā → Torella

Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī The Īśvarapratyabhijñā of Utpaladeva with the Vimarśinī by Abhinavagupta. 2 vols., Delhi […]: Butala & Company 1984 [reprint of KSTS 22/23, 1918/21]

Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī [= Bṛhadvimarśinī] The Iśvarapratyabhijnā Vivritivimarśini by Abhinavagupta. Ed. by Madhusūdan Kaul, 3 vols., Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press 1938/41/43 (KSTS 60/62/65)

Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikāvṛtti → Torella (1994a)

Īśvarasiddhi → *Siddhitrayī*

Ṛjuvimarśinī → *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*

Kāmikāgama Kāmikāgamaḥ Pūrvabhāgaḥ Ed. Svāminātha Śivācārya, Madras: Dakṣiṇabhāratārcakasaṃghaḥ 1975

Kāvyaprakāśa Kāvyaprakāsha of Mammata with English Translation, by Ganganatha Jha, Delhi 1985

Kāvyamīmāṃsā Kāvyamīmāṃsā of Rājaśekhara, ed. by C.D. Dalal and R.A. Sastry, Baroda 1934 (Gaekwad's Oriental Series 1)

Kiraṇatantra → Goodall (1995)

Kulārṇavatantra Kulārṇava Tantra. Intoduction: Arthur Avalon. Readings: M.P. Pandit. Sanskrit Text: Tārānātha Vidyāratna, Delhi 1984

Gītārthasaṃgraha Srimad Bhagavad Gita. With Commentary by Mahāmāheshvara Rājānaka Abhinava Gupta. Ed. Pandit Laksman Raina, Srinagar 1933

Gurunāthaparāmarśa in: Raghavan (1980), p. 1–16

Gurunatha-Paramarsa of Madhuraja Ed. P.N. Pushp, Śrinagar 1960 [KSTS 85]

Cittānubodhaśāstra Rājānaka Bhāskarakaṇṭha's Cittānubodhaśāstram. Ed. by Sushama Pandey, Varanasi 1990 (Āgamagranthamālā)

Tattvaprakāśa → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*

Tantravaṭadhānikā The Tantravaṭa-Dhānika. Ed. with notes by Mukund Rām Shāstrī […], Bombay 1918 [KSTS 24]

Tantrasāra The Tantrasara of Abhinavagupta. Ed. with notes by Mukunda Ram Sastri, Delhi: Bani Prakashan 1983 [Reprint of KSTS 17, Bombay 1918]

Tantrāloka/-viveka The Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the Commentary of Jayaratha. Ed. by R.C. Dwivedi and Navjivan Rastogi. (Enlarged Edition with Introduction) 8 vols., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1987 [Sanskrit text is a reprint of the editio princeps KSTS 1918-1938]

Dhātupāṭha → Liebich (1920)

Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa The Nareshvarapariksha of Sadyojyotih with Commentary by Ramakantha. Ed. Madhusudan Kaul, Srinagar 1926 (KSTS XLV)

Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava with two Commentaries Ṛjuvimarśinī by Śivānanda & Artharatnāvalī by Vidyānanada. Edited by VRAJAVALLABHA DVIVEDA, Varanasi [2]1985 (Yogatantra-granthamālā 1)

Nityādisaṃgraha Nityādisaṃgraha by Takṣakāvarta, Ms. Stein Or. d. 43, Bodleian Library, Oxford

Netratantra / -uddyota The Netra Tantram. With Commentary by Kshemarāja. Ed. by Madhusudan Kaul. 2 vols., Bombay 1926/39 [KSTS 46/61]

Nyāyakośa → JHALAKĪKAR (1978)

Nyāyamañjarī Vol. 1, ed. by Varadacharya, Mysore: Oriental Research Institute

Nyāyasūtra Nyāyadarśanam of Maharsi Gautama & Bhāsya of Maharsi Vātsyāyana. Ed. Dvārikādās Śāstrī, Vārāṇāsī: Bauddha Bharati 1989

Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa → GNOLI (1985)

Parātrīśikālaghuvṛtti The Parātriśikā Laghuvritti by Abhinavagupta. Ed. by Jagaddhara Zādoo Shāstri [...], Srinagar 1947 (KSTS 68)

Parāprāveśikā The Parā Prāveshikā of Kṣhēmarāja. Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Shāstrī [...], Bombay 1918 (KSTS 15)

Paryantapañcāśikā RAGHAVAN: Abhinavagupta and his Works, p. 33-69

Pratyabhijñākārika → *Īśvararatyabhijñākārika*

Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya The Pratyabhijñā Hṛidaya. Being a Summary of the Doctrines of the Advaita Shaiva Philosophy of Kashmir by Kshemarāja. [Ed. by Jagadīsha Chandra Chatterji] śrīnagara saṃvat 1668 [sic !] [KSTS 3]

Prapañcasāratantra Prapañcasāratantra. Ed. Avalon, Calcutta 1935 (Tantrik Texts XVIII)

Bṛhadvimarśinī → *Īśvararatyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī*

Bodhapañcadaśikā [Bodhapañcadaśikā und Anuttaraprakāśapañcāśikā], mumbaī, tattvavivecaka pres. [KSTS]

Bhāskarī Īśvara-pratyabhijñā-vimarśinī of Abhinavagupta. Sanskrit Text with the Commentary Bhāskarī. Ed. by K.A. Subramania Iyer and K[anti] C[handra] Pandey. General Editor: R.C. Divedi. 3 Vols., Delhi 1986. [Reprint of: Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Texts No. 70/83/84, Allahabad [...]: 1938-1954]

Manusmṛti The Manusmṛti with the Commentary Manvarthamuktāvali of Kullūka, ed. by Nārāyaṇ Rām Āchārya, Published by Satyabhāmābāī Pāṇḍuraṅg, For the Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay 1946

Mahānayaprakāśa (TSS) The Mahānayaprakāśa. Ed. by Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī, Trivandrum 1937 (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series CXXX, Śrīcitrodayamañjarī XIX)

Mahārthamañjarī The Maharthamanjarī with the Commentary Parimala of Mahesvarananda. Ed. by T. Gaṇapati Sāstrī [...] (Trivrandrum Sanskrit Series 6)

The Mahārtha-Mañjarī of Maheshvara Nanda with Commentary of the Author. Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Shāstrī [...], Bombay 1918 (KSTS 11) [abridged version of the comentary]

Mānameyodaya The Mānameyodaya of Nārāyaṇa. Edited with English translation by Kunhan Raja and S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri, Adyar 1975 [[1]1933] (Adyar Library Series 105)

Mālinīvijayavārtika Srī Mālinivijaya Vârttikam of Abhinava Gupta. Ed. with notes by Madhusudan Kaul Shastri, Srinagar 1921 (KSTS 31)

Mālinīvijayottaratantra Sri Mālinivijayottara Tantram. By [!] Madhusūdan Kaul, Bombay 1922 (KSTS 37)

Mṛgendratantra [Vidyāpāda and Yogapāda] The Śrī Mṛgendra Tantram with the Commentary of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, ed. M.S. Kaul, Delhi: Panini 1982 (KSTS 1930)

Mṛgendratantra [Kriyāpāda and Caryāpāda] Mṛgendrāgama (Kriyāpāda et Carāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, édition critique par N.R.Bhatt, Pondichéry: Institut Français d'Indologie 1962

Mokṣakārikā → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*

Yajñavalkyasmṛti The Yajñavalkyasmṛti with the Commentary Bālakṛīḍā of Visvarūpāchārya. Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal 1982 [=Trivandrum 1921–22]

Ratnatrayaparīkṣā → *Aṣṭāprakaraṇa*

Ratnatrayollekha → *Aṣṭāprakaraṇa*

Rauravāgama → BHATT (1985)

Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha Śrīmattarkavāgīśvarasāhityācāryābhinandapaṇḍitasamuddhṛtaḥ Laghuyogavāsiṣṭhaḥ [...], Bombay: NSP 1939

Liṅgapurāṇa Liṅgapurāṇam. Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana-maharṣi-śrīvedavyāsa-praṇītam. paṇḍitavaraśrīyuktapañcānanatarkaratnena saṃpāditam — śakābdāḥ 1812

Vijñānabhairavakaumudī The Vijñāna-Bhairava with commentary called Kaumadi [sic] by Ānanda Bhaṭṭa. Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Shāstrī [...], Bombay 1918 (KSTS 9)

Vijñānabhairavatantra → *Vijñānabhairavoddyota* and *-kaumudī*

Vijñānabhairavavivṛti/ -uddyota The Vijñāna-Bhairava with commentary partly by Kṣhemarāja and partly by Shivopādhyāya. Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Shāstrī [...], Bombay 1918 (KSTS 8)

Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa The Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇam. kṣemarāja śrīkṛṣṇadāsena sampāditasya mumbāī śrī vakaṭeśvarastīma mudraṇālayena prakāśitasya punarmudraṇam, Delhi: Nag Publishers 1985

Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakārikāḥ. Ed. Hari Nārāyaṇa Āpaṭe, Poona 1901 (Ānandāśrama Series 43)

Śataratnasaṃgraha Śataratnasaṃgraha of Umāpatiśivācārya with an anonymous commentary (*Śataratnollekhinī*), ed. Pancanan Sastri, Calcutta 1943 (Tantrik Texts XXII)

Śāradātilaka Śāradātilakatantram, ed. Arthur Avalon, Delhi 1982 [^{1}Calcutta 1933] (Tantric Text Series XVII)

Śārṅgadharapaddhati Śārṅgadhara Paddhati, ed. Peter Peterson, Delhi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan 1987

Śivatattvaratnākara Sivatattva Ratnākara of Keladi Basavabhūpāla, Vol. III, Ed. P. Maribasavaradhya, Mysore: Oriental Research Institute 1985

Śivadṛṣṭi/Śivadṛṣṭivṛtti The Śivadriṣṭi of Srisomānandanātha with the Vritti by Utpaladeva. Ed. with Preface & Introduction by Madhusudan Kaul [...], Srinagar 1934 (KSTS 54)

Śivapurāṇa The Śiva Mahāpurāṇa. Ed. Pushpendra Kumar, Delhi: Nag Publishers 1981

Śivasūtra → Śivasūtravimarśinī

Śivasūtravimarśinī The Śivasūtravimarśinī of Kṣemarāja, ed. J.C. Chatterji, Delhi 1990 (KSTS 1) [[1]Srinagar 1911]

Śivastotrāvalī Sivastotrāvalī, by Utpala Devâchârya, with the Commentary of Kshemarâja. Ed. by Rai Pramadâdâsa Mittra Bahâdur [...], Benares 1902 (The Chowkhambā Sanskṛit Series No. 51, Fasc. I)

Śaivaparibhāṣā The Śaivaparibhāṣā of Śivāgrayogin. English Translation S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri. Ed. R. Balasubramanian and V.K.S.N. Raghavan, Madras 1982

Saṃgītaratnākara Saṃgītaratnākara of Śārṅgadeva with Kalānidhi of Kallinātha and Sudhākara of Siṃhabhūpāla. Ed. S. Subrahmanya Sastri. Vol. III. Adhyāyas 5,6. The Adyar Library 1951 (ALS 78)

Sambandhasiddhi → Siddhitrayī

Sāmbapañcāśikā The Sâmbapachâśikâ of Sâmba. With The Commentary of Kshemarâja. Ed. by Durgâprasâd and Kâśînâth Pâṇdurang Parab, Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sâgara Press 1889

Sārdhatriśatikālottara Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama. Avec le Commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. Édition Critique par N. R. Bhatt. Institute Français D'Indologie, Pondichéry 1979

Siddhitrayī [=Ajaḍapramātṛsiddhi, Īśvarasiddhi and Saṃbandhasiddhi] The Siddhitrayi and the Pratyabhijna-Karika-Vritti of Rajanaka Utpala Deva. Ed. with notes by Madhusudan Kaul Shastri [...], Srinagar 1921 [KSTS 34]

Somaśaṃbhupaddhati→BRUNNER-LACHAUX (1963), BRUNNER-LACHAUX (1977)

Stavacintāmaṇi The Stava-Chintāmaṇi of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa. With Commentary by Kṣhemarāja. Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Shāstrī [...], Srinagar 1918 (KSTS 10)

Stavacintāmaṇivivṛti → *Stavacintāmaṇi*

Spandakārika → *Spandanirṇaya*

Spandanirṇaya The Spandakarikas of Vasugupta. With the Nirnaya by Ksemaraja. Ed. [...] by Madhusudan Kaul Shastri, Srinagar 1925 (KSTS 42)

Spandapradīpikā The Spandapradîpikâ of Utpalâchârya. A Commentary on the Spandakârikâ. Edited by Pandit Vâman Śâstrî Islâmpurkar, Benares: E.J. Lazarus & Co. 1898 (Vizianagram Sanskrit Series 16)

Spandasandoha The Spanda Sandoha of Kṣhêmarāja. Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Shāstrī [...], Bombay 1917 (KSTS 16)

Svacchandatantra The Svacchanda-Tantra with Commentary by Kshemarāja. Ed. with notes by Madhusudan Kaul, 6 vols., Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press 1921–35 (KSTS 31/38/44/48/51(Vol. V A)/53(Vol. V B)/56)

Svāyaṃbhuvasūtrasaṃgraha The Tantra of Svayaṃbhū. vidyāpāda. With the commentary of Sadyojyoti, Edited and translated by Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat, New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts 1994

Haravijaya The Haravijaya of Rājānaka Ratnākara. With the Commentary of Rājānaka Alaka, ed. Paṇdit Durgāprasāda and Kāśīnāth Pāṇdurang Parab, Varanasi:

Chowkhamba Sanskrit Sansthan 1982 (Kāvyamālā 22) [[1]Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press 1890]

Secondary Literature

ABHYANKAR, KASHINATH VASUDEV AND SHUKLA, J.M. (1986) A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar. Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Oriental Institute, Baroda

APTE, VAMAN SHIVARAM (1986) The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary Reprinted from the Revised & Enlarged Edition, Poona 1957. Reproduced by Rinsen Book Co., Kyoto

APTE, VAMAN SHIVRAM (1983) The Student's English-Sanskrit Dictionary. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi

ARRAJ, WILLIAM JAMES (1988) The Svacchandatantram. History and Structure of Śaiva Scripture. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Chicago

BHATT, N.R. (ed.) (1985) Rauravāgama. Vol. 1. Institut Français D'Indologie, Pondichéry

BRUNNER, HÉLÈNE (1974) Un Tantra du Nord: Le Netra Tantra. *BEFEO* vol. LXI:125–197

BRUNNER, HELENE (1985) On the Threefold Classification of Śaiva Tantras. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth World Sanskrit Conference. Varanasi, India 1981*, edited by R. N. Dandekar and P. D. Navathe, Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, Delhi

BRUNNER, HÉLÈNE (1986) Le Membres de Śiva. *Asiatische Studien* 40,1:89–132

BRUNNER, HELENE (1992) Jñāna and Kriyā. In: *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism: Studies in Honour of André Padoux*, edited by Teun Goudriaan, pp. 281–312, State University of New York Press, Albany

BRUNNER-LACHAUX, HÉLÈNE (1963) Somaśambhupaddhati. Première Partie. Institut Français D'Indologie, Pondichéry

BRUNNER-LACHAUX, HÉLÈNE (1977) Somaśambhupaddhati. Troisième Partie. Institut Français D'Indologie, Pondichéry

BÜHLER, GEORG (1877) Detailed Report of a tour in search of Sanskrit MSS made in Kásmîr, Rajputana, and Central India. Journal of the Bombay Branch of the RAS. Extra Number, Bombay

BÜHLER, G[EORG] (1896) Indische Palaeographie. Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, B. 1, H. 11, Trübner, Strassburg

BÜHLER, G[EORG] (1979) The Laws of Manu. Sacred Books of the East 25, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, [= Oxford [1]1886]

DVIVEDA, VAJRAVALLABHA (1983a) Luptāgamasaṃgraha. Part II, Collected and Edited by Vajravallabha Dvivedī [!]. Yogatantra-granthamālā 10, Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, Varanasi

DVIVEDA, VAJRAVALLABHA (1983b) Upodghātaḥ, [Introduction to] Luptāgamasaṃgraha. Part II, Collected and Edited by Vajravallabha Dvivedī [!]. Yogatantra-granthamālā 10, Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, Varanasi

DYCZKOWSKI, MARK S.G. (1988) The Canon of the Śaivāgama and the Kubjikā Tantras of the Western Kaula Tradition. SUNY series in the Shaiva Traditions of Kashmir, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi

DYCZKOWSKI, MARK S.G. (1992) The Stanzas on Vibration. The SUNY series in the Shaiva Traditions of Kashmir, State University of New York Press, Albany

GNOLI, RANIERO (1959) Vāc. Il secondo capitolo della Śivadṛṣṭi di Somānanda. *RSO* 34:55–75

GNOLI, RANIERO (1972) Luce delle Sacre Scritture (Tantrāloka). A cura di Raniero Gnoli. Classici delle Religioni [...], Le religioni orientali, No. 25, Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, Turin

GNOLI, RANIERO (1979) Abhinavagupta. Essenza dei Tantra (Tantrasāra). Boringheri, Torino, [1 1960]

GNOLI, RANIERO (1985) Il commento di Abhinavagupta alla Parātriṃśikā. (Parātriṃśikātattvavivaraṇam) Traduzione e Testo. Serie Orientale Roma LVIII, IsMEO, Roma

GNOLI, RANIERO (1989) La Svabodhodayamañjarī. In: Appendix to A.Sironi, La Conoscenza del tremendo. Milano

GONDA, JAN (1976) Viṣṇuism and Śaivism. Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi

GOODALL, DOMINIC (1995) An Edition and Translation of the First Chapters of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the 'Vidyāpāda' of the Kiraṇāgama. Ph.D. thesis, Oxford

GOUDRIAAN, TEUN (1985) The Vīṇāśikhatantra. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi

GOUDRIAAN, TEUN AND GUPTA, SANJUKTA (1981) Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature. HIL, Vol. II, Fasc. 2, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden

GRIER, JAMES (1988) Lachmann, Bédier and the Bipartite Stemma: Towards a responsible application of the common-error method. *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 18:263–277

HANNEDER, JÜRGEN (1998) Śaiva Tantric Material in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. *WZKS*

HOUSMAN, A.E. (1972) The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism. In: *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman. Collected and Edited by J.Wiggle and F.R.Goodyear. Volume III 1915–1936*, Cambridge

JANERT, KLAUS L. AND POTI, N. NARASIMHAN (1970) Indische und Nepalesische Hanschriften. Teil 2. Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden

JHALAKĪKAR, BHĪMĀCĀRYA (1978) Nyāyakośa or Dictonary of Technical Terms of Indian Philosophy. Revised and re-edited by Vāsudev Shāstrī Abhyankar. BORI, Poona

KANE, GEORGE (1969) Conjectural Emendation. In: *Medieval Literature and Civilization*, edited by D.A. Pearsall and R.A. Waldron, pp. 155–169, London

KÖLVER, BERNHARD (1971) Textkritische und philologische Untersuchungen zur Rājaraṅginī des Kalhaṇa. Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden

KREISEL, GERD (1986) Die Śiva-Bildwerke der Mathurā-Kunst. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart

LIEBICH, BRUNO (1920) Zur Einführung in die indische Sprachwissenschaft. III. Der Dhātupāṭha. Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, Heidelberg

MAAS, PAUL (1950) Textkritik. B.G. Teubner Verlagsgemeinschaft, Leipzig, 2nd edn.

MESQUITA, ROQUE (1988) Yāmunācāryas Saṃvitsiddhi. Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien

MEULENBELD, GERRIT JAN (1974) The Mādhavanidāna and its Chief Commentary. Chapter 1–10. Introduction, Translation and Notes. E.J.Brill, Leiden

PADOUX, ANDRÉ (1990) Vāc. The Concept of the Word in Selected Hindu Tantras. State University of New York Press, Albany

PANDEY, KANTI CHANDRA (1963) Abhinavagupta. An Historical and Philosophical Study. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies vol. 1, Chowkhamba Sanskrit series Office, Varanasi, 2nd edn.

PASQUALI, GIORGIO (1929) Maas, Texkritik (Review). *Gnomon* 5.8:417–435

PATKAR, M. M. (1984) Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Shri Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute, Jammu, Vol. 3. Jammu

PATTERSON, LEE (1987) The Logic of Textual Criticism and the Way of Genius. In: *Negotiating the Past. The Historical Understanding of Medieval Literature*, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison

RAGHAVAN, V. (1980) Abhinavagupta and his Works. Chaukhambha Oriental Research Studies 20, Chaukhambha Orientalia, Varanasi

RASTOGI, NAVJIVAN (1979) The Krama Tantricism of Kashmir. Historical and General Sources, vol. 1. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi

RASTOGI, NAVJIVAN (1987) The Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the Commentary of Jayaratha. Ed. by R. C. Dwivedi and Navjivan Rastogi. Vol. 1. Introduction by Navjivan Rastogi. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi

RAU, WILHELM (1954) Lotusblumen. In: *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller*, pp. 505–513

ROCHER, ROSANE (1985) Overlapping recensions and the composing process: ceilings on interest in the Vidyārṇavasetu. *JAOS* 105.3:531–541

SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1985) Purity and Power Among the Brahmans of Kashmir. In: *The Category of the Person*, edited by Steven Lukes Michael Carrithers, Steven Collins, pp. 190–216, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1986) Maṇḍala and Āgamic identity in the Trika of Kashmir. In: *Mantras et Diagrammes Rituels dans l'Hindouisme*, pp. 169–214, CNRS

SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1987) Śaivism. In: *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Mircea Eliade, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York

SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1990a) Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions. In: *The World's Religions: The Religions of Asia*, edited by Friedhelm Hardy, pp. 128–172, Routledge, London

SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1990b) The Visualization of the Deities of the Trika. In: *L'Image Divine*, edited by André Padoux, pp. 31–88, Éditions du CNRS, Paris

SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1992) The Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra. In: *Ritual and Speculation in early tantrism: studies in honour of André Padoux*, edited by Teun Goudriaan, pp. 281–312, State University of New York Press, Albany

SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1995) Meaning in Tantric Ritual. In: *Essais sur le Rituel III*, edited by A.M. Blondeau and K. Schipper, Paris

SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1996) Tantrasāra. Edition and Translation. [forthcoming]

SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1997) Levels of Initiation in the Trika. [forthcoming]

SAWAI, YOSHITSUGU (ed.) (1992) The Faith of Ascetics and Lay Smārtas. A Study of the Śaṅkaran Tradition of Śṛṅgerī. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library 19, Vienna

SHARMA, BRIJENDRANATH NATH (1976) Iconography of Sadāśiva. New Delhi

SLAJE, WALER (1993) Śāradā. Deskriptiv-synchrone Schriftkunde zur Bearbeitung kaschmirischer Sanskrit-Manuskripte. Dr. Inge Wezler. Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, Reinbek

SRINIVASAN, SRINAVASA AYYA (1980) On the Composition of the Nāṭyaśāstra. Studien zur Indologie und Orientalistik, Monographie 1, Dr. Inge Wezler, Reinbek

SRINIVASAN, SRINIVASA AYYA (1967) Vācaspatimiśras Tattvakaumudī. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik bei kontaminierter Überlieferung. Alt- und Neuindische Studien 12, De Gruyter & Co., Hamburg

SYED, RENATE (1990) Die Flora Altindiens in Literatur und Kunst. München

TORELLA, R[AFFAELE] (1994a) The Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā of Utpaladeva with the Author's Vṛtti. Serie Orientale Rome Vol. LXXI, Is. M. E. O., Roma

TORELLA, RAFFAELE (1994b) On Vāmanadatta. In: *Pandit N.R. Bhatt Felicitation Volume*, edited by P.-S. Filliozat, pp. 481–498, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi

TORELLA, RAFFAELLE (1987) Examples of the Influence of Sanskrit Grammar on Indian Philosophy. *EW* 37:151–164

WEITZMANN, M.P. (1977) Review of DEARING, Principle and Practice of Textual Analysis. *Vetus Testamentum* 27:225–225

WEST, MARTIN (1973) Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique. B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart

WEZLER, ALBRECHT (1976) Zur Proklamation religiös-weltanschaulicher Toleranz bei dem indischen Philosophen Jayantabhaṭṭa. *Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte* 27:329–347

WEZLER, ALBRECHT (1981) Studien zum Dvādaśāranayacakra des Śvetāmbara Mallavādin I. Der sarvasarvātmakatvavāda. In: *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus. Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*, edited by K. Bruhn und A. Wezler, Wiesbaden

WEZLER, ALBRECHT (1982) Paralipomena zum Sarvasarvātmakatvavāda (I). *WZKS* 26:149–166

WEZLER, ALBRECHT (1992) Paralipomena zum Sarvasarvātmakatvavāda II: On the Sarvasarvātmakatvavāda and its Relation to the Vṛkṣāyurveda. *StII* 16/17:287–315

The first part of the 'Versified Commentary on the Mālinītantra' (*Mālinīślokavārttika*) by the tenth-century theologian Abhinavagupta, which is translated here for the first time, presents a philosophy of Śaiva revelation, conceived of as a descent of the highest non-dual form of knowledge, through the different levels of speech, into the knowledge embodied in the canon of Tantras or Agamas on which the Śaiva religion is based. The aim of the text is to demonstrate the logic behind the claim of the monistic Tantric schools on which Abhinavagupta bases his philosophy.

The present volume deals in its introduction with the scriptural background of the Śaiva religion because that is a prerequisite for understanding many of the arguments in the text. The translation is accompanied by a re-edition of the Sanskrit text with the help of two manuscripts not consulted before, and a running commentary. A fragment of the *Śrīkaṇṭī*, which is probably the source for some of Abhinavaguptas theories of the Śaiva canon, is transcribed in an appendix.

ISBN 9069801167

Groningen Oriental Studies XIV